

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

436. By Mr. GILLIE: Petition of Ida Steiner and 60 other citizens of Wells and Adams Counties, Ind., urging immediate passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

437. By Mr. ENGEL: Petition of Mrs. Phebe H. Benton, Mrs. R. I. Bonney, and Mrs. V. W. Peck, of Manistee County Pomona Grange No. 21, urging Congress to give consideration to the issuance of honor certificates to all boys who are "frozen" to farm work and who are thereby prevented from serving in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

438. By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolution of George Dilboy Post, No. 529, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of Somerville, Mass., memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide for mandatory war-risk insurance for enlisted men in the armed forces; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

439. Also, vote of the Department of Public Utilities of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts opposing Federal legislation interfering with the power of that department to regulate rates for air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

440. By Mr. BARRY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, requesting the Congress to take appropriate action to eliminate any delay in the final attainment of citizenship on the applications of petitioners of Italian origin who have demonstrated themselves to be loyal and trustworthy, notwithstanding a state of war between the United States and Italy; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

441. By Mr. ROLPH: Senate Resolution No. 18 of the State of California, adopted March 29, 1943, relative to the construction of a multiple-purpose dam on the upper reaches of the Stanislaus River to restrain the usual recurring excess flow of water of said river and to utilize the water so impounded for the generation of electric power, for irrigation, for domestic water supply, and for other useful and beneficial purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

442. Also, resolution No. A-55 of the Railroad Commission of the State of California, opposing House bill No. 1012 and Senate bill No. 246; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

443. By Mr. SPRINGER: Petition of many citizens of Connersville, East Chicago, Scottsburg, LaGrange, Wolcottville, Auburn, Corunna, Howe, Peru, Wabash, Monroeville, Akron, Rochester, and Silver Lake, Ind., urging the adoption of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

444. By Mr. BURCHILL of New York: Memorial of the Senate of the State of New York, that the Congress of the United States be, and hereby is, respectfully memorialized to take appropriate action to eliminate any delay in the final attainment of citizenship on the part of applicants of Italian origin who have demonstrated themselves to be loyal and worthy, notwithstanding the existence of a state of war between the United States and Italy; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

445. By Mr. CASE: Petition of Casper Le Compte and others of the White Horse Community, requesting that certain changes be made in present Indian laws and regulations; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

446. By Mr. SULLIVAN: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 17 of the Nevada Legislature, memorializing Congress to grant relief to the gold-mining industry; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

447. By Mr. GILLIE: Petition of Rev. Russell Weller and 46 other residents of Decatur and Adams Counties, Ind., urging immediate adoption of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

448. Also, petition of Mrs. R. B. Click and 33 other residents of Fort Wayne, Ind., urging immediate passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

449. By Mr. WELCH: Senate Joint Resolution No. 18 of the California Legislature, relative to the construction of a dam on the Stanislaus River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

450. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Flatbush Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to appointing a permanent commission to study and define the peace aims of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 8, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 6, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, Thy glory the heavens are telling and the earth sheweth Thy handiwork. Across the star-strewn spaces, in all the order and majesty of the universe we catch an assuring glimpse of Thy garments vast and white with a hem that we can recognize. Behind all the tangled threads of human affairs we are conscious that hands not our hands are working out the bright pattern of an eternal purpose.

In the heat and burden of our swiftly ebbing day may we be the agents of Thy beneficent will for mankind, with honor unsullied, playing our part in the life of our times. With full purpose of heart, wherever we are called to stand in this epic hour, may we strike our blow for the truth of God and the freedom of man.

"Set our feet on lofty places,
Gird our lives that they may be
Armored with all Christlike graces
In the fight to make men free.
Grant us wisdom, grant us courage,
That we fail not man nor Thee."

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Wednesday, April 7, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Green	Overton
Austin	Guffey	Pepper
Bailey	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hatch	Reed
Barkley	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bone	Hayden	Reynolds
Brewster	Hill	Robertson
Bridges	Holman	Russell
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	Kilgore	Stewart
Butler	La Follette	Taft
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	Lucas	Truman
Chavez	McCarran	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McClellan	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Van Nuys
Danaher	McNary	Wagner
Davis	Maloney	Wallgren
Downey	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Murdoch	White
George	Nye	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis
Gillette	O'Mahoney	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent on an inspection tour of military camps.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent, holding hearings in the West on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate Small Business Enterprises.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is absent on official business as a member of the Small Business Committee of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 700) suspending certain provisions of sections 12B and 19 of the Federal

Reserve Act until 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war, as determined by proclamation of the President or concurrent resolution of the Congress.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2397) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 52. An act for the relief of Hazel M. Lewis;

S. 257. An act for the relief of Christine Lund;

S. 258. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to consider the claim of Lew O. Calhoun;

S. 404. An act for the relief of Richard Barker; and

S. 854. An act for the relief of the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS):

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"STATE OF NEW YORK,

"IN SENATE,

"*Albany, March 2, 1943.*

"Whereas the Pharmacy Corps bill, S. 216 (H. R. 997) is now pending in Congress, providing for the creation of a Pharmacy Corps in the United States Army, to be organized under graduate pharmacists skilled and learned in the compounding and dispensing of drugs and medicines; and

"Whereas in the treatment of disease and the care of the sick or injured the services of skilled, reliable, and experienced graduate pharmacists are essential, and such services are second only to the services of skilled physicians and surgeons; and

"Whereas it is the well-established public policy of the United States and of every State thereof to require all persons engaged in the compounding and dispensing of drugs and medicines to be graduate pharmacists; and

"Whereas such public policy is vital and necessary to the safety, health, and life of its people; and

"Whereas the health, safety, and preservation of life of every member of the armed forces of the United States is of primary and paramount importance for the safety of the Nation; and

"Whereas members of the armed forces of the United States, and especially those of them who are overseas at various fighting fronts, are entitled to receive, and it is the policy and desire of the people of the United States to furnish to them, the best treatment and most proficient services within the power and capacity of the people, and especially to furnish proficient and skillful graduate pharmacists to safeguard the health and lives of its fighting men; and

"Whereas the compounding and dispensing of drugs and medicines is essentially a professional service requiring great skill, intimate knowledge, and experience with drugs and medicines: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of New York (jointly), That the Legislature of this State unanimously endorse the Pharmacy Corps bill, S. 216 (H. R. 997), and request the Members of Congress to enact the same into law; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Surgeon General of the United States Army, and to the New York State Members of Congress."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OF PUERTO RICO,

"*San Juan, Puerto Rico.*

"At the session held by this legislative body on February 19, 1943 (third regular session of the fifteenth legislature), the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas certain political leaders and certain economic forces wage an organized campaign in Washington against the Governor of Puerto Rico, the Honorable Rexford G. Tugwell;

"Whereas this campaign is being waged in Washington on the grounds that Governor Tugwell is forcing his own personal ideas upon the people of Puerto Rico;

"Whereas on the basis of such an assertion a part of the public opinion of the United States might be brought to believe that Governor Tugwell is acting contrary to the wishes of the people of Puerto Rico;

"Whereas the Legislature of Puerto Rico, as sole power democratically representative of the people of Puerto Rico, is in duty bound to make public its views and its will in order to give expression to the democratic reality of Puerto Rico and disabuse the minds of our fellow citizens of the United States of America as regards the true significance of the attacks against Governor Tugwell and his administration; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico:

"1. To declare, as it hereby declares, that Gov. Rexford G. Tugwell has the support of the majority of the people of Puerto Rico and of the Legislature of Puerto Rico.

"2. To make it a matter of record that the fundamental legislation for the improvement of the living conditions of the Puerto Rican people was discussed directly with the people during the election period, received the votes of the people, and was passed by the Legislature of Puerto Rico before Mr. Tugwell was appointed Governor of Puerto Rico or had come to have any official contact with our country.

"3. To declare, as it hereby declares, that all the legislation approved was part of the political platform on which the majority of this legislature, and also the greater part of the minority of this legislature, were elected.

"4. To transcribe in evidence of the foregoing the following excerpts from the platforms of the various parties represented in this legislature which took part in the last election held in Puerto Rico:

"PLATFORM OF THE POPULAR DEMOCRATIC PARTY

"The Popular Democratic Party will supply executive branch of the government with all the means to insure the enforcement of the 500-acre law. Its legislature will make regulations therefor, to the end that corporations may not scoff at the rights of the people, and will base such regulations on policies that will benefit directly the greatest number of families consistent with the efficiency and production of the lands made a subject of distribution as a result of the enforcement of this law. We will strive to the end that the land subject to the provisions

of this law be recovered for the benefit of laborers, of small farmers, and of co-operators of farmers and workers.

"Legislation to insure that sugarcane growers receive the full amount they are entitled to receive from the product of their effort and their land. If necessary, the grinding of sugarcane and its processing into sugar will be declared a public-service industry, and its duty toward the farmer, the workman, and the sugar consumers of the island will be regulated in order to establish a fair distribution of the profits derived from such activity, guaranteeing the permanent operation thereof for the benefit of the Puerto Rican community on the basis of reasonable profits for the owners of the sugarcane-grinding industry, and abolishing all existing monopolies in the matter.

"Effective steps toward the reformation of the banking system in order to establish the Banco de Puerto Rico, liberalize credit to farmers, businessmen, manufacturers, and workers of the island, and facilitate the development and improvement of Puerto Rican economy.

"An ample program will be submitted with all the necessary requirements for the development and utilization of water resources.

"Legislation will be enacted so that all aggregados may acquire without cost to themselves a piece of land that will serve to guarantee their individual freedom and be the source of their civic awareness.

"Measures for the protection of our industries so that they may develop and prosper."

"PLATFORM OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF PUERTO RICO

"The Socialist Party of Puerto Rico declares that the natural wealth and the riches produced in Puerto Rico by labor in its manifold and varied manifestations, are monopolized by resident and nonresident natural and artificial persons; that the vast latifundia, inventions, and the prodigious applications of machinery to sugar production and other industries, are monopolized by absentee capital.

"That the industrial and social wealth which is the product of the effort and labor of all the citizens who in the past and the present have applied and are applying their intelligence and muscle to produce it is not only not enjoyed by those citizens but is also sent out of the country in the form of incomes, dividends, and profits, thereby compelling the producing community of Puerto Rico to suffer dire and painful consequences; and for these reasons:

"The Socialist Party of Puerto Rico, upon making this declaration of redeeming and humane doctrine, resolves to declare before the public conscience of Puerto Rico and of the United States, that the industrial economic system which predominates in this island is directed and controlled by selfish and baneful monopolies of absentee and resident capital, and that it does not fulfill the civilizing purpose and the design of human justice that our country demands.

"Measures for economic, social, and human advancement: To increase the powers of the Legislature of Puerto Rico to adopt solutions of the problems of the centralization of lands and absenteeism.

"Technical organization of industry: The Socialist Party, well aware of the need for the technical organization of industries, considers that the promulgation of legislation has become necessary, and to that end will strive to obtain the establishment of credit institutions in harmony with the requirements and development of industries.

"Public ownership of public utilities: A part of the natural resources of the people of Puerto Rico is in the hands of public utilities. The capital represented is nonresident. If

Puerto Rico were able to connect public utilities with the administration of the government, the majority of the economic and social ills from which it is suffering would be suppressed.

"The services rendered by these public utilities represent, for the community in general, an annual outlay of a considerable sum of money, amounting to millions of dollars, which not only is not reinvested but which migrates, serving to pay dividends, interest, and compensation to persons, while the industrialization of our island, the telephone and telegraph, steam and electric railroads, and other resources, continue undeveloped in Puerto Rico.

"These resources in the possession of the state would be an invaluable source of advancement and of general comfort and welfare.

"The Socialist Party advocates that the state, through well-planned and carefully considered enactments of the Legislature of Puerto Rico, take over the utilization of the natural resources of the island, including land and maritime communications, piers and warehouses all along our coast line, operation of water resources—considering this is the white coal that we can produce for steam and electric industrialization—and the other resources that so far remain unexploited in Puerto Rico."

"PLATFORM OF THE COALITION OF THE UNION-REPUBLICAN AND SOCIALIST PARTIES"

"Examination and survey of all the natural resources and other factors, as a foundation for the possible establishment, promotion, and development of industries capable of producing successfully for export.

"Continuation of the agricultural policy initiated by the coalition (of the Union-Republican and Socialist Parties)

"Establishment of business cooperatives, of the barter of products for consumption, and of agencies for the creation abroad of markets for our agricultural and industrial production.

"Continuance of our program of extension and development of subsistence farms, furnishing them with agricultural implements, seeds, livestock, and homes, and providing the necessary means for the enforcement of homestead laws.

"To promote and contract a loan of not less than \$1,500,000 to be applied to the construction of homes for laborers and to the improvement of those already in existence, and to the purchase of land and the creation of farms to be supplied with all the required agricultural implements, animal power, seeds, fertilizers, and everything else needed.

"The natural resources of the land, such as waterfalls (water resources), forests, mines, fisheries, etc., should be conserved and developed under the direction of the state.

"PLATFORM OF THE PUERTO RICAN TRIPARTITE UNIFICATION, NOW THE PUERTO RICAN LIBERAL PARTY"

"Extension of the farm and homestead program.

"Amplification of the system of subsistence farms.

"Industrial promotion, not only by means of protective legislation, but also by means of such financial assistance as may be required.

"Establishment of credit facilities for agriculture and industry for the purpose of affording them cheaper credit by the creation of the necessary organizations.

"Establishment of such relations between the colono and the central, and between the laborers and employers in sugarcane and other agricultural products, as will guarantee to each the enjoyment of that share of profits to which each of them may be entitled from the standpoint of a fair conception of contribution to production.

"Maintenance and enactment of such laws concerning land tenure as consolidate and strengthen the foundations of our general economy.

"Establishment of a water resources administration that will assist our agriculture and furnish the people cheap irrigation and electric energy in the rural and the urban districts. This policy does not imply the elimination, or a merger with the general system, of those public systems which, as in the case of the Guayama irrigation system, are operating in a solvent and efficient manner."

"5. To declare that, as is very well shown by the platform hereinabove transcribed, Governor Tugwell, far from arbitrarily forcing ideas upon the people of Puerto Rico, is carrying out, as behooves an executive under the democratic system defended in this war, a program of reforms known to and ardently desired by the people of Puerto Rico, which was discussed with the people when their votes were solicited during the election campaign, which was sanctioned directly by the people, and which the Legislature of Puerto Rico enacted in democratic compliance with the mandate of the people.

"6. To declare further that such program, far from being anything new, aims at securing for the people of Puerto Rico the enjoyment of measures enacted either for Puerto Rico or the United States or numerous States a good many years ago, and which are opposed only by a certain group in Puerto Rico because of the habitual belief of this group that our people can be deprived of rights won long ago by the people of the United States and by the civilized peoples of the world in general.

"7. To declare that for all the foregoing reasons Governor Tugwell, as a democratic executive, and until such time as the people of Puerto Rico elect their own executive, represents the democratic forces of Puerto Rico and the democratic principles the defense of which is involved in this war.

"8. And to request from the President of the United States as a democratic expression, as it is hereby requested, that the Honorable Rexford G. Tugwell remain in the governorship of Puerto Rico until our people have the opportunity of electing their own chief executive, this latter being the only democratic alternative to the permanence in Puerto Rico of a Governor who effectuates the program of the people and of the Legislature of Puerto Rico.

"9. That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs of the Senate, the Secretary of the Interior, the Governor of Puerto Rico, the Resident Commissioner for Puerto Rico in Washington, and to the American press."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by the pastor and members of the Methodist Church at Oswego, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Petitions of sundry citizens and church organizations, all in the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A letter embodying a resolution adopted by the Frederick (Md.) Branch of the American Association of University Women, favoring the enactment of the so-called Thomas-Hill bill, being the bill (S. 637) to authorize

the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS AND NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS—LIST OF PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a tabulation showing the localities from which 11,602 petitions have come to me asking favorable consideration of Senate bill 860.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Arkansas: Monte Ne.....	1
California:	
Chowchilla.....	1
Covina.....	1
Garden Grove.....	1
Huntington Park.....	1
Los Angeles.....	4
San Diego.....	2
Yarba Linda.....	2
Colorado: Manzanola.....	2
Connecticut: Madison.....	1
District of Columbia: Washington.....	2
Florida:	
Gainesville.....	1
Green Cove Springs.....	7
Georgia: Jesup.....	1
Illinois:	
Chicago.....	1
Lansing.....	1
Indiana:	
Akron.....	1
Bluffton.....	1
Muncie.....	1
Richmond.....	1
Iowa:	
Des Moines.....	1
South English.....	2
Kansas: Delphos.....	27
Kentucky: High Splint.....	1
Maine: Presque.....	1
Missouri:	
Clarksville.....	31
Columbia.....	1
Dexter.....	1
Kansas City.....	124
Neosho.....	1
Palmyra.....	53
Rolla.....	39
Tipton.....	93
University City.....	20
Versailles.....	62
Nebraska:	
Blue Springs.....	4
Crookston.....	1
Omaha.....	1
New Mexico: Roswell.....	1
New York:	
Binghamton.....	23
Hamburg.....	51
Hyde Park.....	3
North Carolina: Swannanoa.....	12
North Dakota: Foxhohn.....	1
Ohio:	
Cambridge.....	64
New Philadelphia.....	2
Warren.....	1
Wilmington.....	1
Pennsylvania:	
Alliquippa.....	1
Philadelphia.....	1
Wilkinsburg.....	1
Oklahoma:	
Ada.....	1
Coyle.....	2
Medford.....	1
Perkins.....	1
Roland.....	2

South Carolina: Latta	1
South Dakota: Yankton	1
Tennessee:	
Maryville	1
Rives	1
Texas:	
Anahuac	1
Austin	1
Beville	137
Big Springs	1
Brownfield	1
Cameron	1
Camp Wallace	11
Cleburne	1
Corpus Christi	102
Dallas	148
Edinburg	3
El Paso	61
Gainesville	1
Grand Saline	1
Houston	2
Itaska	1
Jacksonville	4
Lampasas	2
Lexington	45
Lometa	2
Lubbock	36
Maud	1
McLean	1
Mount Vernon	150
Orange	1
Pecos	1
Perryton	1
Port Neches	40
Post	2
Raymondsville	10,000
Riviera	20
San Antonio	1
Santo	56
Terrell	1
Texarkana	1
Waco	2
Virginia: Norfolk	60
Washington:	
Custer	23
Seattle	1
Wisconsin:	
Ashland	2
Woneewoc	1
Wyoming: Laramie	1

Total..... 11,602

REPORTS OF MILITARY AFFAIRS COMM'TTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 367. A bill for the relief of dependents of Frank Edward Dace; without amendment (Rept. No. 158).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 805. A bill for the relief of William D. Warren; without amendment (Rept. No. 159); and

H. R. 1857. A bill to provide for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 160).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on April 7, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 222. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico certain real estate now under the jurisdiction of the United States;

S. 223. An act to authorize the exchange of lands between the War Department and the Department of the Interior;

S. 224. An act to authorize the exchange of lands in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., be-

tween the War Department and the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard, deceased;

S. 319. An act to authorize the acceptance of a permanent loan to the United States by the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art, and for other purposes;

S. 427. An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the Army of the United States assigned to diving duty;

S. 800. An act to authorize certain officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to act as notaries public during the existence of war or a national emergency and 6 months thereafter;

S. 829. An act to amend sections 6 and 11 of the act approved July 24, 1941, entitled "An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes," as amended, to provide for the grade of commodore, and for other purposes;

S. 853. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1909, as amended by the act of January 23, 1942, providing for the sale of naval stores, in order to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to permit the sale of naval stores in the continental United States during the war and 6 months thereafter to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and to other persons at stations where purchase from private agencies is found to be impracticable;

S. 886. An act relating to the selective-service deferment, on occupational grounds, of persons employed by the Federal Government; and

S. 903. An act to amend section 602 (d) (1) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McNARY (for Mr. BARBOUR): S. 979. A bill granting a pension to Ralph L. Taylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHANDLER: S. 980. A bill to provide for placing the name of Lloyd Weeks Benedict upon the emergency officers' retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself, Mr. BONE, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. BREWSTER):

S. 981. A bill to assist in relieving economic distress in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands by providing work for unemployed persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD: S. 982. A bill to provide that the unexpended proceeds from the sale of 50-cent pieces coined in commemoration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the city of Albany, New York, may be paid into the general funds of such city; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2397) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ELIMINATION OF PRIVATE SUITS FOR PENALTIES AND DAMAGES ARISING FROM FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES—AMENDMENT

Mr. McNARY (for Mr. BARBOUR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BARBOUR to the bill (S. 920) to eliminate private suits for pen-

alties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

GOVERNMENT PROPAGANDA

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, last Friday I inserted in the RECORD a statement setting out indications of bias in the abstracts from publications dealing with post-war programs, issued by the Legislative Reference Bureau of the Library of Congress. The Director of the Bureau, Mr. Griffith, in a personal interview denied any intentional bias in that work, and I offered to submit for inclusion in the RECORD any statement he might wish to make in regard to the matter.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by Mr. Griffith in a letter he wrote me under date of April 6. The statement by the Director, however, is not a conclusive answer to the chief point raised in my statement.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, April 6, 1943.
The Honorable RAYMOND E. WILLIS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You have been good enough to call my attention to the extension of your remarks which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 2, 1943, and to ask me for any comments or additional facts bearing upon the subject. However, before proceeding to the main topic, I do want to thank you sincerely for your very kind remarks concerning the Legislative Reference Service. We try to give the Members the assistance which they desire, and recognize that impartiality and the absence of any suggestions of propaganda are absolutely essential to our operations.

It is for this reason that I welcome the opportunity to clarify the relationship of the State Department to the abstracts which we prepare of publications relating to post-war problems. Some misunderstanding must account for the statement that the selection of materials to abstract is determined "in every instance . . . by agents of the State Department and the Office for Emergency Management." The selection is made by and in the Library, and the only stipulation which the State Department makes is that the articles, books, and documents selected for abstracting shall contain within them some significant contribution toward the analysis or solution of post-war problems. In furtherance of this instruction, our staff members strive to examine all the material in print (except newspapers) which comes into the Library every day. In what is currently available in published form, during the few months in which this project has been operating, there have been only a few items hostile to the administration's stated policies in the fields of international trade and peace aims. The complete absence on the part of the Legislative Reference Service of any bias one way or the other can be best indicated by the inclusion in the abstracts of a very considerable number of articles which are anti-administration in some of the other fields.

I must assume personal responsibility for the particular six samples which were circulated to the Members of Congress. Attempt was made to include a crosssection of material as it was being received, so that the Members might know what to expect if they wished to receive copies of the abstracts. The

most careful rereading of them does not suggest to me that they have a bias in any one direction. Certainly none was intended, nor were any of our workers conscious of bias.

You quite properly raise the question as to why we abstract the State Department's own publications. The reason is quite a simple one. So many of the Federal agencies are, at the present time, giving attention to the problems of demobilization, the unscrambling of wartime controls, and probable conditions in the international field, that the abstracts are used, not by the State Department alone, but by a number of other research bureaus within the Government. To these other bureaus, an abstract of a State Department publication is a quick and convenient way of learning its contents. The project as originally conceived and as now carried out is intended to avoid serious duplication and to make it unnecessary for several agencies themselves to try to discover and analyze what is appearing in print of interest to their special assignments. The Library of Congress seems to be the most appropriate agency to examine virtually the entire flow of printed materials for this purpose.

Once more let me thank you for your courtesy in the matter and for your words of appreciation.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,

Director, Legislative Reference Service.

FUEL OIL SITUATION IN THE EASTERN TERRITORY

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to have made a part of my remarks in the RECORD a very interesting and encouraging letter which I received today from Mr. John J. Pelley, president of the Association of American Railroads. It is a short letter, and I shall read it. It is as follows:

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS,
Washington, D. C., April 7, 1943.

Hon. FRANCIS MALONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONEY: You will recall that I appeared before the Special Committee to Investigate Gasoline and Fuel Oil Shortages on January 27 and outlined to the committee what had been accomplished by the railroads up to that time in moving oil into the eastern territory and what we hoped to accomplish in the future.

In this connection you will, I am sure, be interested in knowing that for the week ended April 3 the railroads handled into the eastern territory an average of 933,966 barrels per day. The daily average in tank cars for that week was 912,919 barrels and handled in drums moving in boxcars 21,047 barrels.

This is the peak record up to date in the movement of oil by rail into the eastern territory, the previous peak being for the week ended September 19, 1942, when the daily average was 856,710 barrels. You may be assured the railroads will do everything that can be done not only to continue this record but to better it in the months that lie ahead.

Sincerely yours,

J. J. PELLEY.

Mr. President, I should like to add that, in view of this very encouraging letter, plus the fact that the so-called 20-inch pipeline to the east coast has been approved and that the larger pipeline, the so-called big inch line, will be completed this year, the oil situation in the distressed area, not taking into consideration the needs of the military forces, looks much more encouraging than it has.

STATUS OF NEGROES AND OTHER MINORITY GROUPS IN ARMED SERVICES AND WOMEN'S AFFILIATED AUXILIARY MILITARY ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 132), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or a subcommittee thereof, to consist of five members, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the status of the Negro and other minority groups in the armed services and in attached or affiliated auxiliary military organizations for women, with a view to ascertaining (a) the extent of compliance by the armed services and the Selective Service System with the requirement of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, that the selection and training of men be accomplished without racial discrimination, (b) the nature and extent of any practices in the organization and placement of personnel which accomplish the exclusion of persons because of race or color from the assignment to any type of unit or any type of service on land, at sea, or in the air, (c) the extent to which opportunities, for training, appointment, or advancement in the commissioned grades are restricted on the basis of race or color, (d) the extent to which considerations of race or color are impeding the full utilization and development of professional and technical skills, and (e) the relation of the system of segregated units to the effective utilization and appropriate placement of persons on the basis of individual competency and merit. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$1,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

WINNING THE PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WAGNER

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Winning the Peace," delivered by Senator WAGNER on April 7, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICANISM VERSUS INTERNATIONALISM IN THE POST-WAR PICTURE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHEELER

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Americanism versus Internationalism in the Post-war Picture," delivered by him on the Washington Evening Star Forum on April 7, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR PROBLEMS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. DANAHER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of post-war problems, delivered by Senator TAFT on the Washington Evening Star Forum on April 7, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE EAU CLAIRE (WIS.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Small Business Must Not Be an Unnecessary War Casualty," delivered by him before the Eau Claire (Wis.) Chamber of Commerce on March 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

AN ADDITIONAL WEAPON FOR JAPAN—ARTICLE BY SENATOR LA FOLLETTE

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article written by him, entitled "An Additional Weapon for Japan," published in the Progressive for Monday, April 5, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POETIC TRIBUTE TO FATHER DUFFY

[Mr. McNARY (for Mr. BARBOUR) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Father Duffy," composed by Martin M. Clifford, past State chairman of the Knights of Columbus of Jersey City, N. J., which appears in the Appendix.]

PALESTINE A PLACE OF REFUGE FOR THE JEWS—ARTICLE BY JAMES G. McDONALD

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by James G. McDonald entitled "The Time for Discussion Is Past," published in the March 9, 1943, issue of the New Palestine, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR PRODUCTION AND LABOR—ADDRESS BY L. METCALFE WALLING

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of current war production and labor, delivered by L. Metcalfe Walling, Administrator, Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division, United States Department of Labor, at Springfield, Mass., March 5, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PHONEY WAR ON INFLATION—ARTICLE BY MERLO PUSEY

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an article by Merlo Pusey, entitled "Phoney War on Inflation," published in the Washington Post, of April 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THOMAS JEFFERSON BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an article by Will P. Kennedy dealing with the activities of the late Representative John J. Boylan, of New York, in connection with the celebration of the bicentennial of Thomas Jefferson, which appears in the Appendix.]

MONOPOLY AND BUREAUCRACY—EDITORIAL FROM "AMERICA"

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Monopoly and Bureaucracy" published in "America," which appears in the Appendix.]

EXECUTION OF HENRYK EHRlich AND VICTOR ALTER—REMARKS BY DAVID DUBINSKY

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, remarks made by David Dubinsky at a meeting of protest against the execution of Henryk Ehrlich and Victor Alter, which appear in the Appendix.]

ORGANIZATION AND COLLABORATION OF UNITED NATIONS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an editorial

entitled "Give It a Hearing," from the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, of March 30, 1943, and an editorial entitled "The Senate Answers the Challenge" from the Norwalk (Ohio) Experiment, of April 1, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which is in the nature of a substitute. If any amendment is to be proposed to the committee amendment, it should be offered before a vote is had on the committee amendment.

NORWAY'S DAY OF SORROW

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, tomorrow will be the 9th of April, a day which looms large in the history of this country and looms large in the history of a little country across the water. That country is Norway.

The destiny of the free people of Norway has been forever joined to the destiny of the free people of the United States by the inexorable hand of God.

Norway and the United States have the same allies—the United Nations.

The United States and Norway have a common foe—the Axis.

We even share the same day of sorrow, April 9.

On April 9, 1940, Hitler's forces, with the aid of Quisling's Judases, violated the shores of neutral Norway.

On April 9, 1942, the United States War Department announced the fall of Bataan in the Philippines after 3 months of heroic resistance.

April 9, 1943, Bataan and Norway are still in the grasp of our barbarian enemies. But today the growing might of American production and American arms is striking at the Axis; its supreme goal the liberation of all Axis-subjugated peoples all over the world.

Norwegians are doing their part to win this victory. Norwegians are serving in the air, on the sea, and on the land under the banners of Norway and of other United Nations. Norwegian ships and Norwegian sailors carry American war materials to every fighting front. And in Norway itself resistance is going on—and it will go on until the last vestige of Axis oppression is destroyed for all time.

When the enemy launched his sneak attack on the Norwegian coast on the night before April 9, 1940, he lost between one-fourth and one-third of his then existing fleet, a fact not generally known. From that moment forward, the people of Norway have never neglected an opportunity to attack the invader.

Quisling was immediately put in power by the Nazi, but his short-lived cabinet was never able to assemble, and 6 days later the initial Quisling government was forced to resign. King Haakon was the constitutional monarch of Norway. He continues to be the constitutional mon-

arch of that nation. The pretense at government which the Nazi-Quislings set up is, in the eyes of the world, as it is in the minds of the Norwegian people, unconstitutional and illegal, commanding neither obedience nor respect.

In this connection, I should like to read an open letter to Vidkun Quisling, whose name has displaced even that of Judas as the very symbol of betrayal, from Francis Biddle, Attorney General of the United States. The letter is contained in an official publication of the Royal Norwegian Government under date of April 9. I now quote the letter, which is addressed to Vidkun Quisling:

When for the love of power, a man attempts to sell the dignity of his own people, Vidkun Quisling, he sells nothing but his own soul.

For a brief moment he wields the sword; but it is a lonely, meaningless gesture, Vidkun Quisling, and the command meets only the silence of a contemptuous world.

Borrowed armor is a deadly thing, Vidkun Quisling. It is no firmer than the source from which it came. It falls apart and leaves him who has worn it against his own people, naked, alone, unready for the wrath of men whose freedom and dignity are beyond price.

The source from which you borrowed strength is waning, Vidkun Quisling. Already there are cracks in the armor and the contempt of the world, the wrath of men is unabated.

You are ruling, Vidkun Quisling, past the hour. You are living, Vidkun Quisling, on borrowed time. You have spent, Vidkun Quisling, the last of the 30 pieces of silver.

If this is the contempt of the Attorney General of the United States, how much more terrible must be the surging hatred of the Norwegians themselves.

No loyal Norwegian has cooperated with Quisling or with his master, Hitler. Every loyal Norwegian has struck back at the traitor and the barbarians he represents with all the vigor that characterized the Vikings of old—the Vikings who discovered America, the Vikings who, in 1066, invaded England, after having lived for a generation in France, the Vikings who in 750 settled in Dublin and in Cork.

Quisling tried to appease the nearly 300,000 members of the National Athletic Association by means ranging from bribery to threats of death, or prison camps. Since 1940, not one athletic contest has taken place in Norway in which the contestants were Norwegians.

When he was foiled in his attempt to gain control of the membership of the National Labor Federation, which had a membership of approximately 350,000, the puppet traitor brought about the reduction of wages and an arbitrary raising of living costs. But, he could not break the undying spirit of the Norwegian workingman. Norwegian workers, today, are the spearhead of the living movement of resistance which will eventually bury the Quisling movement.

Wounded by his failure to enslave mature Norwegians, Quisling aimed a Herod's blow at Norwegian children. He decreed that the children between the ages of 10 and 18 years, should become members of the Ungdomsfylking, a youth organization patterned after the Nazi Jugend. He decreed that

teachers must join the Nazi-controlled Norges Lærersamband—Norway's teachers organization. As a protest, 12,000 of Norway's 14,000 teachers resigned, and more than 700 teachers were sent to the concentration camp near Lillehammer. After weeks of torture, those who remained alive of the 700 were shipped off to a work camp near the Finnish border. Yet, the teachers who were not imprisoned or killed resisted and continued to resist.

Quisling tried to force his master's new order upon the Norwegian Church. He suspended the pledge of silence which Norwegian law required of all clergymen concerning facts confided in them by their parishioners. As a consequence of this move, 7 bishops and 1,100 pastors resigned. The Norwegian Church is a church of God and of free men, not of idols and of slaves who cringe before them. The world knew that. Vidkun Quisling has learned to his sorrow that from the blood of a single martyr there spring a thousand true believers.

Every action of the slave betrayer has been met with stubborn disobedience. Five political parties, representing 92 percent of the voters of Norway, united to oppose him. He disbanded this united organization. The disbanded group still continued to checkmate him at every turn.

He attempted to intervene in local and district governments, only to encounter mass resignations of governors and mayors.

Norway's national legislative body, the Riksting, has confounded Quisling by suspending its operations indefinitely.

Since December 12, 1940 Norway's Supreme Court has refused to meet.

Quisling cannot control organizations and groups which have, voluntarily, and as an attack upon him and the evil which he represents, gone out of existence.

I know the immeasurable strength of the Norwegian character—as certain, as powerful as the sea that breaks against the bounds of their native fjords. I know that strength because both my parents were born in Norway.

The people of the State of Wisconsin, which I have the honor, in part, to represent, appreciate the deep-rooted democracy of the Norwegian people. The many thousands of American citizens of Norwegian ancestry who live in my home State have made lasting contributions to its progress and its greatness.

And the people of the United States, in common with all right-thinking people everywhere, are well aware of the manner in which Norwegian resistance has aided the cause of the United Nations.

When the Axis is crushed, defeated by triumphant United Nations, Norwegians can attend a pure church, send their children to the instruction of loyal teachers, resume honest work and honest recreation, and live under a government which has denied the right of invaders to defile it.

Norway will see that day of restoration and liberation.

The United States, with men and machines, will hasten the coming of that day.

Norway and the United States have shared the day of sorrow—April 9.

Through trial and torture and punishment and pain, our two nations will fight side by side, together, until we and all United Nations share another day, the day of victory.

RESTRICTION OF POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I want to make it plain at once that I am shocked by the War Department order of recent date that "no member of the military forces on active duty will hereafter become a candidate for or seek or accept election to any public office not held by him when he entered upon active duty." I can understand the necessity for discouraging ordinary political activities on the part of members of the armed forces. But this order nullifies the fundamental rights of American citizenship. It inhibits, furthermore, the rights of our whole people to turn to the military establishment for high leadership in civilian places of high authority if civilian judgment wants to turn in that direction. I deny the right of the War Department to militarize the processes of American democracy. I deny the right of the War Department thus indirectly to control American elections. I think I can understand the purpose. But I, for one, repudiate it. If the American people ever desire to draft a member of the military forces for high American responsibility, it will take more than the petty dictum of the War Department to deny them this high privilege. We are not yet totally at the mercy of our self-serving overlords. If a great American emerges, for example, as the next, most eligible President of the United States, the War Department cannot stop him just because he happens to be a member of the military forces on active duty, and it will make a blunder, as ineffectual as it will be transparent, if it tries.

THE FARMER AND INFLATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I desire to call to the attention of the Senate an interesting statement by the Northeastern Dairy Conference just received by me. In this statement I find four questions asked, as follows:

1. How can farmers be the cause of inflation when they are selling their farms to go to work in factories?
2. How can farmers be the cause of inflation when dairy herds are being sold because of insufficient returns to pay bills and hired labor?
3. How can farmers be the cause of inflation when the farm has been stripped and is continuing to be stripped of hired labor by the attractiveness of factory jobs?
4. How long would the protected industrial worker stand it if he worked 80 hours per week instead of 48; if he worked for approximately one-half of what he is now getting and then was called insulting names?

Mr. President, to some it may seem that the picture here given is very much overdrawn, but those acquainted with the farm situation at present realize that many farmers see it just about that way.

All efforts to find a "class goat" for inflation are unfair and in the long run will fail. We have inflation for a very

simple reason. The Federal Government is paying out money now at the rate of \$100,000,000,000 a year instead of approximately \$10,000,000,000 a year.

National income payments to individuals have gone up from \$76,000,000,000 to approximately \$115,000,000,000 in 2 years. National income payments to individuals this year promises to go to \$130,000,000,000 and, perhaps, to \$140,000,000,000.

At the same time the amount of goods and services for which these tremendous sums in purchasing power can be exchanged has dropped by one-third; by the end of this year perhaps it will be cut by almost one-half.

Price controls and wage controls, applied simultaneously and reasonably, if made in time, can retard the progress of inflation. So can taxation, if the taxation is applied where the increases in income are the largest. The Government has, so far, done none of these things.

A year ago price controls on commodities were initiated. But wage controls were not attempted, and then only halfheartedly, until months later. Of course, wage increases, especially in total volume of wages paid, increased production costs as well as purchasing power. Prices beat against ceilings, naturally. As this process continues, prices and wages will continue to advance alternately but steadily.

The remedy is not to attach the blame to the farmer, nor to any one group, but to try to prevent the spread between supply and purchasing power from increasing still further.

SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with an amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the pending legislation deals with one of the most critical aspects of the manpower problem. It undertakes to supply funds and to provide some machinery to assist in securing sufficient farm labor for the production and the harvesting of essential agricultural crops.

It is unnecessary for me to discuss the importance of increased agricultural production in the present very unusual period of our national history. The fact that the available labor on the farms of the Nation has been seriously depleted both by reason of the more attractive wages offered in industry as well as by having workers drawn into the armed forces is a matter of common knowledge. Various surveys indicate that there is a shortage of from 700,000 to 1,000,000 in the manpower necessary to be had on the farms of the country in order to reach the production goals which have been set by the Department of Agriculture.

The hearings before the committee demonstrated that the farmers are preparing large areas for planting. With good luck, a slight increase in the

amount of machinery, and an increase in the labor supply, despite all the difficulties which confront the farmers it is not at all impossible that they will reach the high goals which have been fixed for this year's production.

Some months ago the responsibility for the recruitment and placement of farm labor was transferred from the Manpower Commission to the Department of Agriculture. A few weeks ago the Honorable Chester C. Davis was appointed the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution, and was charged with the responsibility of assisting the farmers of the country to secure adequate labor for the production and harvesting of their crops.

The pending measure appropriates funds to assist in that movement. The original Budget estimates which were sent to the House requested an appropriation of \$65,000,000. The measure as it passed the House carried an appropriation of \$26,100,000. After very careful consideration, the Senate committee recommends to the Senate an appropriation of \$40,000,000, which is more than the amount carried in the joint resolution as it passed the House, but is a considerable amount below the Budget request and the estimate of the sum necessary to be had in order to do the work.

The Senate will observe that the joint resolution as reported by the Senate committee is really in two parts. The first part relates to the recruitment and placement of farm labor within the several States and within the counties of the several States. The committee was of the opinion that the county extension agents and the State extension services would be better informed as to the available supplies of labor, as well as to where the labor was most needed, than would any other agency. We have, therefore, made available to the State extension services not less than \$13,500,000 and not more than \$20,000,000 of the funds that are appropriated. It is estimated that from 85 to 90 percent of the labor which will be secured will be obtained within the several States. Most of it will of necessity be recruited locally.

We had before us a number of the directors of the extension services of the States. Many of the States have already formulated programs and have made considerable progress. The boys and girls in the high schools have been enrolled in a corps of farm workers. Several of the States have passed local laws which permit the children in the schools to be absent for as long as 30 days at one time, provided they are engaged in agricultural labor under the specified supervision. Some of the States, notably New York and California, have not only passed laws but have provided appropriations for the maintenance of local committees that are attempting to grapple with this very serious problem of the shortage of labor.

Now, we are very hopeful that with the plans which have been formulated and with the work which has been done, the county agents will, from the schools and from among the people with farm experience who are living in small towns, be able to secure large labor resources.

The other program relates to the activities of the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the first section, will he yield so that I may ask a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator has indicated that he thought that, speaking generally, from 80 to 90 percent of the labor would be obtained in the local areas involved. Is there to be an importation from outside the country of the balance of the necessary labor?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was just approaching that subject.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well.

Mr. RUSSELL. Agreements have already been entered into with the Republic of Mexico whereby it is hoped to secure at least 50,000 Mexican laborers for the crops raised principally in the Southwest and in the sugar-beet areas. An agreement has been entered into with the colonial government of the Bahama Islands whereby 5,000 experienced farm workers from those islands will be brought into this country. I understand that the first load of them is now on the way, and it is proposed that they shall start work on the vegetable crops in Florida, and will work their way up the entire Atlantic seaboard, working on the crops as they mature in different periods, and perhaps going as far north as the State of New York and other States in that locality.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. However, there is nothing in the measure to prevent the importation of workers from any country; is there? In other words, if the Administrator desired to send to Europe and to bring into this country citizens or persons living in Europe, there is nothing in the measure which would prevent him from doing so; is there?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; there is nothing in it which would prevent him from bringing in anyone who is not an alien enemy. No citizen of a country with which the United States is at war can be brought in under this measure; but I may say that as a practical matter it would be almost impossible today to transport labor from Europe to this country, in view of the fact that every country in Europe has a much greater manpower problem than does the United States. They need all available labor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What about the refugees from Europe who seek entry here?

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say that there is nothing in the joint resolution as I now recall, which would prevent the importation under a temporary entry permit of any foreigner who is not a national of a country with which we are now at war.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me ask whether the joint resolution would sus-

pend in any degree the immigration laws?

Mr. RUSSELL. It only suspends the immigration laws to the extent that it would waive the head tax on the persons brought in for this purpose.

Mr. VANDENBERG. But it would not suspend the quota system, would it?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; it would not suspend the quota system. I appreciate that suggestion from the Senator from Michigan.

I may say to the Senator from West Virginia that, of course, no number of aliens could be brought in in excess of the number allowed under the quota for the country from which they derive their nationality.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the point.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator mean that there is a limitation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course. There is nothing in the measure which would suspend any of the quota laws. The quotas do not apply to Mexico or to the Central American republics; but there is nothing in the joint resolution which would suspend the quotas which were established by the basic immigration act of 1924 or which would increase the number who could come in under the quota system. There is that limitation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator feel that the immigration laws would not be suspended by implication if we should give the Administrator power to bring in persons from other countries as they may be needed?

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly do not believe that the joint resolution would suspend by implication the Immigration Act of 1924 as to quotas. There is nothing in the joint resolution which would suspend or in any wise affect the quota system. The Senator is well aware that there is no quota in the case of Mexico and the other American Republics. The quotas apply only to Europe, and there is a provision against the importation of Asiatics. There is nothing in the joint resolution which would suspend the quotas even if, as a practical matter, it were possible to bring in aliens from Europe.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Is it not a fact that the contract which has been entered into with the Republic of Mexico provides for the return of the laborers when they are no longer needed in the United States?

Mr. RUSSELL. All the contracts provide for the return of the laborers to the country of their origin, whether it be Mexico or the Bahama Islands. Not only do the contracts so provide, but the Administrator has placed the imported agricultural laborers under the direction of a United States Army officer, with the idea that he will see that they are kept together and properly provided for, and that after they have performed their

services in this country they will be returned to the country of their origin.

Let me say to the Senator from West Virginia that as a practical matter it is not contemplated that laborers will be brought from Europe. In addition, it would be practically impossible to get them out of Europe, because all the countries of Europe have a very acute manpower problem. The powers proposed to be granted by the joint resolution would exist only during the remainder of this calendar year. All the powers proposed to be created by the joint resolution would expire on the 31st of December 1943.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator made the statement that it would be impossible to get laborers from Europe.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I did not make the statement that it would be impossible. I said that as a practical matter it would be very difficult if not impossible to get them out.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I accept the correction. Has there not been quite a clamor for returning transports to bring persons from Europe to America?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not heard of any such clamor; but, so far as I am personally concerned, I shall be very happy to accept any amendment to the joint resolution which would prevent the importation of persons from Europe. I think it should be so worded that we would not be denied the opportunity of utilizing the labor of prisoners of war from Europe who might be brought into this country. In the hearings before the committee it was developed that the British were relying very largely on Italian prisoners of war in England at the present time for the production of farm crops, and that they had proved to be the most efficient laborers they could find. However, with the exception of prisoners of war, I should have no objection to an amendment to prohibit the importation of any person of European origin.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should like to ask a further question. With whom was the contract with respect to Mexican citizens entered into?

Mr. RUSSELL. The original contract was entered into in behalf of what might be called a commission, which consisted of representatives of the State Department and of the Department of Agriculture who signed on behalf of the American Government, and the Secretary of Labor, or the equivalent officer, of the Mexican Republic who signed on behalf of the Mexican Republic. The entire agreement is set forth in the House hearings.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator says that the contract provides for the return of those persons to Mexico.

Mr. RUSSELL. It does.

Mr. REVERCOMB. But if another contract should be made there is nothing in the joint resolution which would provide for their return.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing in the joint resolution, but there is ample provision in the immigration laws. The moment they cease their duties here they are subject to deportation. The committee had before it the Assistant Director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, who stated that if any of them undertook to stay in this country the Immigration and Naturalization Service would endeavor to see that they were deported under the ordinary deportation procedure.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Would it be possible under the terms of the joint resolution to import agricultural laborers from Puerto Rico?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would certainly be possible.

Mr. TAFT. That would be entirely possible, would it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. Is there any plan to use the funds proposed to be appropriated for importing agricultural laborers from Puerto Rico?

Mr. RUSSELL. No such plan was brought to the attention of the committee.

Mr. TAFT. We found from 100,000 to 150,000 men unemployed in Puerto Rico, many of whom, I am sure, would be physically capable of coming here. I wish to suggest that some effort be made to do something along that line. We were told that 15,000 Puerto Ricans actually signed up for mechanical work, and stated their willingness to put up \$100 of their own money in each case to come to the United States, and that nothing had been done about it. Apparently no effort whatever has been made to recruit agricultural laborers from Puerto Rico, and it seems very strange to me that no such effort should be made when we there have a vast supply of American citizens who are out of work and who are capable of performing agricultural labor.

Mr. RUSSELL. No reason was assigned before the committee for not importing Puerto Ricans. However, it occurs to me that one reason might be that in ordinary times in this country we have a surplus of agricultural laborers. Only in a period of great emergency is there any dearth of farm labor in the United States. If labor is imported from the Bahamas or Mexico, we can force the laborers to return when the period of the emergency has passed. Puerto Ricans, being citizens of the United States, there is no way to compel them to return to Puerto Rico. That is the reason which occurs to me; but I do not know why Puerto Ricans have not been imported.

Mr. TAFT. I feel confident that they would be perfectly willing to return to Puerto Rico, and would desire to do so in most cases. Puerto Rico is somewhat farther away than the Bahamas, but it is no farther away than Jamaica; and I do not know of any reason why we should not avail ourselves of the supply of American citizens in Puerto Rico.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to have the suggestion of the Senator.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. For the information of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], let me say that as a practical matter I think there is no chance for the importation of any agricultural workers from Europe. If he fears such a result, I must differ with him.

In California we would welcome any efficient farm operators, because otherwise we may be in a very desperate condition. I was informed that in the Azores there were several thousand very fine Portuguese who were very proficient in the dairy business as milkers and in taking care of herds. Our need for such dairy workers was so great that I immediately discussed with the State Department, the Army, and the Navy the possibility of securing workers from those islands, and I was informed by all the governmental agencies that there would be no chance of our bringing in any agricultural workers from Europe or from Asia.

For more than a year I have been concerned over the problem of importing Mexican workers. In the West, at least, where we have had wide experience with workers from Mexico, and some from Puerto Rico, we have found that the Mexican workers are thoroughly acceptable to our people. They are congenial and are liked by our people. They do very fine agricultural work. On the other hand, it was the opinion of almost all our farm leaders that the Puerto Ricans would not be satisfactory, and that once they were brought into this country there would be very great difficulty in returning them.

Mr. RUSSELL. We could not return them unless they should desire to return.

Mr. DOWNEY. Every method is being employed to safeguard the return of the workers from Mexico when their services are no longer needed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to make a brief observation with reference to the remarks of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. Of course, we are all sympathetic toward the effort to obtain agricultural laborers in the United States during the present critical times. We wish to obtain cotton pickers, vegetable pickers, and other farm workers. However, in justice to ourselves and in justice to the boys who are doing the fighting, our own citizens should have the opportunity of working on our farms. They should be given the opportunity to pick citrus fruits and vegetables in Florida, and cotton in the Southwest. I am most sympathetic toward the effort to obtain farm labor, but why neglect our own people? In Puerto Rico there are more than 250,000 unemployed. We complain because we have spent millions of dollars in Puerto Rico; but when there is an opportunity for Puerto Ricans to come here and work, we pay more attention to

foreign groups than we do to our own citizens.

I think it is the duty of the Congress to insist that Puerto Rican citizens be given an opportunity to come into the continental United States. I know the excuse which is given. The Senator from Georgia was correct in his statement. There is a fear that the Puerto Ricans will not go back to Puerto Rico. Can any Senator stand on this floor and justify such an objection? I am sure the Puerto Ricans would go back of their own volition. But for groups of people in this country at a time we are fighting a war for democracy to say that we cannot allow our own citizens to come here and work because of a fear that they will not return to the place where they came from, is an untenable position to assume.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BONE. As I read the pending joint resolution rather hurriedly, I saw in it no discrimination against the importation of Puerto Ricans.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing in the measure which would prevent them from coming into the United States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Oh, no; there is nothing in the joint resolution which would prevent that.

Mr. BONE. Perhaps I misunderstood the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; there is nothing of that character in the joint resolution. What I am complaining about is this: About 2 weeks ago I read in the newspaper that some Bahamians were being imported to the State of Florida. On instructions of the Senate committee was sent to Puerto Rico. During its investigation it found poverty, starvation; but many of the Puerto Ricans are good laborers. I inquired why there was a preference on the part of Florida, or any other State, for Bahamian rather than Puerto Rican labor. I inquired of officials of various departments as to what efforts were being made to utilize Puerto Rican labor in this country, and I found that some of the officials are just as scared as some Members of Congress apparently are. I was told that such a procedure would tend to reduce the wage standards of labor in this country. I do not think it would. Puerto Ricans also like to receive good wages, but they will work according to the circumstances at the time; they will work for the prevailing wage.

Mr. President, we talk about a Puerto Rican problem; it is an American problem. We created it. So I shall continue to insist that the departments of the Government, either under the pending joint resolution, or under the law as it now exists, give opportunity to Puerto Rican citizens. One of the generals on Guadalcanal was a Puerto Rican. His poor relatives in Puerto Rico—if he has any poor relatives, as I am sure he has—are not now being given an opportunity to work within the continental United States.

Mr. O'DANIEL and Mr. BONE addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if there is any provision in the pending measure which would prohibit those coming from foreign countries from accepting work other than that of an agricultural nature.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing in the pending measure which would prevent that, but as I recall in the contract between the United States and Mexico, there is contained language to the effect that Mexican nationals shall accept no employment other than agricultural employment.

Mr. O'DANIEL. There is nothing whatever in the proposed legislation which would restrict the employment of labor to the agricultural field?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing except the fact that if they do not engage in agricultural labor they are sent back to the country from whence they came.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Is that provided for in the pending measure?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; it is not. It is not spelled out in the joint resolution, but it is in accordance with the terms of the contract, with Mexico, as I recall. At least it was testified before the committee that that is the method by which the situation had been handled up to then.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Does it not appear to the Senator from Georgia that after arriving in the continental United States from other countries to engage in agricultural work, such persons might be tempted by higher wages afforded by industrial work and accept employment in those lines? If nothing prevented them from doing so it would not serve to help agriculture very much.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is something which would prevent them from doing so because if they should engage in other than agricultural labor they would be immediately deported. If they should undertake to engage in industrial labor they would be deported. If they should refuse to work on agricultural labor wherever it is available, they would be immediately deported.

Mr. O'DANIEL. If that is the situation, I should think it could be construed as a prohibition against them accepting other employment.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator asked me if it was spelled out in the measure, and I say that it is not, but it is in the agreements, or contracts, to which I have referred, and has been a part of the policy pursued up until the present time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I was very much interested in the remarks of the Senator from California [Mr. Downey]. I believe he has stated an issue, so far as I am concerned, with respect to the pending bill. I believe he stated he would welcome foreign labor to California. I wish to take the position funda-

mentally in this time of war, that I do not welcome foreign labor into this country. When young farmers of the country are fighting on foreign soil, and upon the high seas, I do not wish to see such a situation created in America, that the farms and industries of the country will be operated by men from other lands.

A short time ago the Senate passed the Bankhead bill for the deferment of farm labor. It is now in the other House, where it seems to have been slowed down. A chilling hand seems to have touched it. If that bill were passed and should become a law, I submit to the Senate that there would be no occasion for us to talk about importing foreign labor. I think it is very fundamental at this time, as the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez] said a while ago, to think first of our own citizens and not to send them into the battle lines, and use men from other lands to fill their places of employment.

Mr. President, I make these comments in view of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from West Virginia that the Senator from California was expressing his own views and not expressing the views of the committee if he stated that he was in favor of importing foreign labor. I am sure the committee would be opposed to the importation of a considerable number of foreign farm laborers from Europe. There might be difficulties involved in returning such laborers to the land of their origin.

I want to say to the Senator, who referred to the young men in uniform, that all our hearts are with them, and the purpose of the pending measure is to furnish a sufficient supply of labor to insure that our men in uniform shall be fed. The total number of foreign laborers affected by this joint resolution is less than 6 percent of the total labor need and of those whom we hope to employ in order to assure that men at the front, as well as civilians at home, shall not suffer for the lack of food.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I have a request to make, if the Senator from Georgia can comply with it, and that is that he insert in the Record as a part of this debate a copy of the Mexican contract which has been referred to and which I presume is typical of the average contract under this sort of operation.

May I ask also at this point if men have been brought into the United States and are working under that contract, and if so, what is the authority for the execution of the contract?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am very frank to say that I do not believe there is any specific statutory authority for the execution of the contract. There may be, but the contract was entered into, nevertheless, by the Department of Agriculture with the Government of Mexico.

Mr. BONE. Are Mexicans now permitted freely to enter this country?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; they are not permitted freely to enter the country, but if anyone thinks that the country will be overrun with Mexicans he is deceiv-

ing himself. The fact is that the Mexican Government does not want its nationals to come into this country. They have a border patrol. The committee had evidence to show that at that time Mexicans were rushing to the border in large numbers and were endeavoring to get into this country, but the Mexican Government stopped them at the border and sent them back to their homes, refusing to let them come in. The trouble has been to get a sufficient number of Mexicans to labor on our farms, not that we have been swamped with Mexicans. We have had difficulty in getting a sufficient number to take care of the long staple cotton in Arizona and New Mexico and to save the vegetable crop in California. We are not being swamped with Mexican labor, but the Department has been trying to get a sufficient number to take care of the present farm-labor problem.

Mr. BONE. I fear the Senator misunderstood the purport of my question. I understood the statement made on the floor was to the effect that there was no quota in operation as affecting Mexico, and I was merely inquiring about the status of the Mexican who attempted to immigrate to this country, and I was wondering, if there is no quota system, what arrangement exists between the two governments?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Arizona is present, and I ask him to clear up that question.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, no alien can come from any country in the Western Hemisphere unless he has a passport visaed by an American consul, and to obtain such a visa he must pass an educational test; he must show that if he comes to the United States he will not become a public charge, and he must show that he is in good health.

Mr. BONE. Are those the only restrictions? If there is no quota, suppose a million men from Guatemala or Honduras or Mexico desired to come into the United States, and met the qualifications, could the 1,000,000 come under this arrangement?

Mr. HAYDEN. They could come just as a million Canadians could come.

Mr. BONE. I am merely seeking information, I am not making an argument; but I should like to know if that is the case?

Mr. RUSSELL. They could not come in under this arrangement, they could come under existing law. This measure would not increase the number.

Mr. HAYDEN. The quota applies to European immigration only; it limits the number that may come from Germany, France, Spain, and other European countries in proportion to the number of people of the particular race who are in this country. There is an absolute prohibition of oriental immigration. It does not, however, apply to the Western Hemisphere, to anyone from Mexico or South America, for instance, so that such immigration is actually regulated by the visa system. We protect our country by providing that no one can come in from Canada, from Mexico, from Guatemala, from Brazil, or any

other country unless he can satisfy our immigration standards. He has got to pass a literacy test, show that he will not become a public charge, and that he is not suffering from any disease. When we have had difficult times in this country it has been practically impossible for any farmer to obtain such labor, and the practical effect of this measure will be to relieve, to some extent, that situation.

Mr. BONE. I raised the question merely in order to clarify this immigration picture. I am frank to say that I did not realize that the barriers were down to quite the extent which has been suggested, and that the only restriction was one the individual may find imposed on himself by lack of financial responsibility and education. Assuming that there is financial responsibility and education in the individual himself, and he could secure the visa from a diplomatic representative of this Government in the countries whence he desires to come, he would have no trouble in getting into the United States, would he?

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say that it is not quite so easy as it sounds, for, as a matter of present practice, these countries will not let their nationals come into the United States. They endeavor to restrain them in every way they can. They have border patrols, and the agreement with Mexico makes it plain Mexico does not want any great number of her citizens to come to the United States, for fear it will disturb the economy of the Republic of Mexico.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator kindly respond to a few inquiries I should like to make?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to undertake to do so.

Mr. DANAHER. I think the Senator can do so. I invite the Senator's attention to section 2 on page 6. I understand from that section that the payments are to be made to the States in a sum not less than \$13,500,000 and not more than \$20,000,000 and that the sums so apportioned are to be available for expenditure by the Agricultural Extension Service of the States. Let me ask the Senator first, please, whether or not the agricultural extension services referred to are State services or Federal services at the present time?

Mr. RUSSELL. The reference is to State services, because there is no such thing as a field service for the Federal Extension Service.

Mr. DANAHER. Then, inviting the Senator's attention to lines 20 to 22, inclusive, it follows, does it not, that the Agricultural Extension Service at the present time, the State services within the States, are to be subjected to supervision and approval by the Administrator, at least, in respect of the sum to be apportioned to the States?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true at the present time. The Senator is well aware that under the Morrell Act, under the Smith-Lever Act, and all other extension appropriations an allocation is made on a formula provided by Congress, and none of the funds is to be paid until an arrangement satisfactory to the Secretary of Agriculture shall

have been entered into between the Federal Government and the State agencies. This is merely a continuation of that. The Secretary of Agriculture now has the right to withhold Federal funds from any State unless the State extension service submits an agreement for the expenditure of the funds in a way satisfactory to the Secretary of Agriculture. This does not give to the Agriculture Department any new power over the State extension services.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Insofar as we would authorize the recruitment and placement and training of workers, we would not authorize the taking of any worker against his consent; would we?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing on earth in the joint resolution that requires any involuntary labor of any kind.

Mr. DANAHER. Then, will the Senator turn to page 10, lines 18 to 24, where we find the proviso stated in the limitation set forth. The proviso says that should the county extension agent refuse to give his consent in any case to the removal of a worker from County A to County B, let us say—I now quote:

Any interested or affected person may appeal to the Administrator, and the Administrator may permit the expenditure of such funds for the transportation of such worker from such county if the Administrator finds that the services of such worker can be more effectively utilized at another place of employment.

First, let me ask the Senator, who is the interested or affected person who may appeal to the Administrator?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was afraid someone was going to ask that question. In my opinion, that would give an appeal to the man who wished to employ the laborer, the laborer himself, the laborer's wife, or the laborer's child, or any representative of the United States Government who is engaged in the recruitment and placement of these laborers. That is my construction of it.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me ask the Senator another question: Is there any control over any such agricultural worker by the United States Employment Service?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not sure I understand the Senator's question.

Mr. DANAHER. Under the system of job priority being set up in the United States Employment Service, no worker may work except in a given industry until and unless he has a certain type of certificate from the United States Employment Service. I, therefore, ask whether or not the United States Employment Service in any respect known to the Senator will have jurisdiction in any way over these agricultural workers?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is contemplated that the United States Employment Service will be utilized to locate the workers and to notify the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution, as well as the county agents, as to where the labor is located; but unless the United States Employment Service is given direct authority over these laborers, I do

not know any power they would have at all.

Mr. DANAHER. Would not the United States Employment Service or its representatives be such an "interested or affected person" as to be able to move a man from County A and County B?

Mr. RUSSELL. They would have an appeal to the Administrator, undoubtedly.

Mr. DANAHER. Conversely, they would have the power to deny unemployment certificates within the county in which Mr. A is a resident unless he consented to go to County B.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is true, but I do not think this measure impinges on the authority of the employment service in the slightest degree.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me ask the Senator, under the language on page 9, lines 15 to 24, and following, is it the Senator's understanding that this measure will supplement or supersede in any respect the work of the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am very frank to say that I think this joint resolution transfers all the power for the transportation interstate of migratory farm labor from the Farm Security Administration to the Administrator of Food Distribution and Production. However, there is nothing in the measure that prohibits the Administrator from utilizing the facilities of the Farm Security Administration. It is contemplated that, so far as existing camps are concerned, that he will utilize the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator's answer coincides exactly with my own understanding, and I wish to thank him.

Calling his attention to page 12, beginning in line 14, there is reference to the Farm Security Administration, and I assume that the reference deals with recoupment by that agency for the use of facilities which now are chargeable to the Farm Security account. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. The purpose of subdivision (d) on page 12 is to provide for covering into the Treasury any funds received for the account of any of the farm placement centers, including the camps which are under the operation of the Farm Security Administration. Heretofore, the Farm Security Administration has collected a certain amount from people who were in the migratory labor camps, which has been placed in a revolving fund. This measure provides that all such receipts, whether from the Farm Security Administration, or the Federal Extension Service, or any other agency, shall be covered into the Treasury.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I understand that there is a limitation of some 2 percent on the total fund appropriated for administrative expenses.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Is that 2 percent limited to the difference between \$20,000,000

and \$40,000,000, or is it on the entire appropriation?

Mr. RUSSELL. It applies to the entire \$40,000,000.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. LANGER and Mr. McNARY addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to ask the Senator to clarify section 4. I call the attention of the Senators from Montana, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, and Arizona, where sugar beets are raised, to this particular section. We in the Northwest rely on migratory labor, we have migratory laborers coming into our section by the hundreds of thousands. Employment of such labor is the only way by which we can possibly harvest our crops, as I think the Senators from the Northwest who are present will agree.

In section 4 we find the following language:

No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county, if such worker has resided in such county for a period of 1 year or more immediately prior thereto and has been engaged in agricultural labor as his principal occupation during such period.

I can easily envisage a situation in which thousands of folks in one of the States of the South would be through picking cotton. During the preceding year they had moved North. They move with the seasons. Am I to understand that before such workers could come to the Northwest to help us with our threshing and our harvesting every one of them, some of whom cannot read or write, some of whom do not know their rights, would have to go to a county agent? Would they have to go to a county agent and get permission to come, for example, from the State of Georgia to the State of North Dakota, or the State of Montana, or the State of Idaho?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not understand the measure has that effect at all. There is nothing in the joint resolution which would impose the slightest restraint on labor. Any private contractor from the Senator's State could go into any other State of the Union, whether it be Georgia, Wyoming, Washington, or any other State, recruit all the labor he pleased, and move them wherever he pleased, and no one would have to sign, and no one would have to approve. This provision is to prevent the use of Federal funds to impose upon the very class of labor to which the Senator refers, as well as to keep an equalized supply of labor in the country.

A number of instances were brought to the attention of the subcommittee, and doubtless to the attention of the

other House, instances of the United States Employment Service and other agencies of the Government using some outrageous methods in forcing laborers to move from one section of the country to another by intimidation and threats.

If the Senator will turn to the hearings, he will find there one very significant letter. The United States Employment Service sent out this letter to a large number of farm laborers and farm tenants:

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE,
Rome, Ga.

Your selective-service occupational questionnaire shows you have a farm background. Please see Mr. Ernest Farmer in the United States Employment Service Office at 522 Broad Street, Rome, Ga., by Monday, January 25, 1943.

M. A. N. PATTON,
Manager.

There is evidence in the RECORD that when some farm tenants and sharecroppers who were under contract, and did not wish to leave their contracts, who were satisfied with their housing conditions, who were satisfied with their contractual relations with their landlords, presented themselves to the United States employment officer, he told them that they had registered as farmers, and that they would either go to Florida to gather vegetables or would be inducted immediately into the Army.

There is an instance of a responsible citizen writing in to his Representative in Congress to ascertain whether the United States Employment Service had the power to put a man in the Army if he did not leave his farm and go to Florida to gather vegetables. There should be a brake somewhere to prevent that kind of thing occurring. Therefore we provide that before any such practice as that can be carried on, the county extension agent has to approve the man leaving.

There were other illustrations, such as that of the authorities going into one county and, by intensive recruitment, moving as much as 50 or 60 percent of the local labor in the county, and such as that of people in one county going over to another county and engaging in competitive bidding for labor, so that the crops in one area would fail absolutely for lack of gathering, because all the labor had been drawn off to crops that could afford to pay a slightly higher wage.

Section 4 is an effort to stabilize the use of labor so that it will be employed most effectively. Any person affected by it can write a letter to Mr. Davis, if he feels he is entitled to transportation at Government expense, and Mr. Davis has a right to say, "You have a right to go at Government expense"; but no person can restrain him.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I believe an impartial reading of section 4 will indicate that, taking an extreme case, although there might be four or five thousand workers who were not at all needed in a given county farther south, the county agent,

by refusing to sign up and permit them to go north, could freeze them in that county. Is not that true?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not true at all, as I see it. The Senator may construe it in that way, but I do not so construe it, because the Administrator has absolute power in the matter. If the Senator will read the succeeding section, he will find that the Administrator has absolute power to nullify anything the county agent might do.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia permit me to make an observation in reply to the question of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be very glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. OVERTON. The situation to which the Senator from North Dakota refers is not at all affected by the pending measure. Any laborer may move from any county to any other county, or from any State to another State, at his own will. There is no effort on the part of Congress, through the enactment of the pending measure, to produce a situation of involuntary servitude, because constitutionally we could not do it. We are merely creating a new agency to help in the present labor situation, and we are supplying the agency with funds. So far as the funds of the Government are concerned, they may be employed solely under the restrictions set forth in section 4.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia permit me to ask the Senator from Louisiana a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator to do so.

Mr. LANGER. Assume that a large farmer in the State of Montana wishes to hire 500 men who are in Georgia. How would he proceed, under section 4?

Mr. OVERTON. He could go to Georgia and get the 500 men, if they wished to go, but he could not take advantage of the funds appropriated by the pending measure to transport them.

Mr. LANGER. If Congress is to appropriate \$40,000,000, why should not the farmers in Montana or North Dakota or Wyoming have the benefit of that fund?

Mr. OVERTON. Because, on the other hand, Government funds can be used to deplete a county or a State of labor which the county or the State absolutely needs. Why should the Government funds be used for that purpose?

Mr. LANGER. There may be an excess amount of labor in a county, and the laboring men may want to go north to work but do not have the funds necessary to make the move.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not believe there is a county agent in the United States, whether it be in Georgia or North Dakota, who, if there were 4,000 or 5,000 surplus laborers in his county, would interpose objection to their being moved. If there were 4,000 or 5,000 surplus laborers and he would not permit them to move, he would not keep his job very long.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator from Georgia will agree with me that under section 4 the county agent

has the power to block the movement of labor?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; he does not have such power.

Mr. LANGER. A man affected may appeal, of course.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. It is so simple that a man can write a letter, and it will be considered to be an appeal.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VAN NUYS in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad the Senator from North Dakota has raised this question. It was raised in the committee. Perhaps it may be well to call attention to the language of the bill as it came from the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad if the Senator will do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If Senators will turn to page 4 of the bill, beginning in line 7, they will find the language which was written in on the floor of the House dealing with this subject matter. It reads:

Provided further, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county, or for the transportation of any worker outside the limits of the State where he resides or is working without the prior consent in writing of the commissioner of agriculture for such State or other official who performs similar functions for such State.

It was perfectly obvious upon the reading of that language that Congress was providing a large appropriation to make migratory labor accessible and available to agricultural employers throughout the United States. But at the same time it was saying, "This purpose, this objective of Congress, may be defeated utterly and completely by any county agent in a county in which there is a surplus supply, or by any agricultural commissioner in any county where there is a surplus supply, upon his own motion, in his own discretion, for reasons which are satisfactory to him, and without giving any reason to anyone at all."

The criticism in the committee, I think, was practically universal that no such broad power should be delegated by Congress in making a labor appropriation to county and State officials.

As one member of the committee, I sought to have the whole matter stricken. The committee took the other view and adopted the language to which attention has now been directed by the Senator from North Dakota.

To me the language is still open to objection. The argument which the Senator from Georgia has made is, to my mind, no argument at all. He quotes from a communication which was written by a citizen of Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; by an employee of the United States Employment Service who was sent to Georgia.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I beg the Senator's pardon. He is quite right. But the incident, I think, happened there.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The situation which is there described is simply this: An employee of the United States Employment Service exercised or attempted to exercise a power he did not possess. He had no right to say to any worker, "You go to Florida or else you will go into the Army." It was altogether outside his jurisdiction. And now, because, forsooth, an employee of the United States Employment Service in a State somewhere is willing to attempt to exercise power he does not possess, and to compel workers to go where he wants them to go or else go into the Army, we are asked to say in a law that the county agent shall have such power. We are now proposing to say in connection with an appropriation designed to provide labor for all agricultural employers throughout the United States that a county agent may veto the act of Congress.

The power was taken away from the State agricultural commissioner in this provision which the committee has adopted. And then this provision, to which the Senator from Georgia draws attention, was written:

Provided, That upon the refusal of the county extension agent to give his consent in any such case, any interested or affected person may appeal to the Administrator, and the Administrator may permit the expenditure of such funds for the transportation of such worker from such county if the Administrator finds that the services of such worker can be more effectively utilized at another place of employment.

In fairness to the committee and to the distinguished Senator from Georgia, who has had a particularly onerous task in working out this bill, I may say that the purpose of that language was to prevent the sort of thing which I criticized in the committee and which I have criticized on the floor. My thought is that it will not be effective, because the migratory workers for whom we are trying to provide employment in this bill are persons who are not likely to make such an appeal. We are creating an obstruction. My feeling was, in the committee, and still is, that this provision ought to be stricken from the bill. In that event, when the matter goes to conference the conferees will have a perfectly free hand in writing a provision. They cannot write a more liberal provision than that which is contained in this section.

My feeling is that even though we are appropriating money, and that this provision applies only to those who derive the benefit of the money, and does not in any way prevent a worker traveling on his own funds or on the funds of someone else, it is nevertheless a restriction upon the free movement of labor, which should not be written into a law of Congress at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this provision is not intended as any restriction on the movement of labor anywhere. Its purpose is to prevent the expenditure of Federal funds to dislocate the supply of labor and to hire labor from counties or from areas where the labor is needed.

To hear the distinguished Senators speak one would think that Congress

was undertaking to pass a law which would forbid a farm laborer leaving the county of his residence. Nothing could be further from the truth. The bill does not undertake in any wise to place any restrictions whatever on any farm laborer anywhere in the United States. It merely says that these funds shall not be used to drain off labor from one county or one section where it is needed, for the benefit of another county or of another section. It will operate between counties as well as between the State of Georgia and the State of Wyoming, as illustrated by the Senator from Wyoming.

Senators talk about the measure interfering with the movement of migratory labor. This provision does not affect migratory labor. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] overlooks the language which provides that if the worker has not resided in the county for a period of 1 year, and been engaged in agriculture during that year, there is no restriction whatever upon his movements. It does not affect the migratory laborer in the ordinary sense of the word who moves from one crop to another crop, and from one State to another State, because unless the man has been living in the county for the full period of a year and been engaged in agriculture during that year the funds may be expended to remove him from that county.

The whole theory of the joint resolution, let me say very frankly, is to give the largest possible measure of control to the States and to the State agencies. The joint resolution decentralizes the program. As to whether or not it will work, I do not know.

The joint resolution as it came to the House from the Budget Bureau vested all the power in the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution. As the measure came to the Senate from the House, it undertook to put all the authority in the county extension agents and in the Federal Employment Service.

We have revised the joint resolution so as to give the county agents absolute control of the local recruitment of labor, with the Federal agency to have the power to move labor into a State and to handle such farm labor as might be imported.

There is nothing in the joint resolution which is inconsistent with the whole theory of doing such work or of handling such labor. Certainly, no agency should reach into Georgia or Wyoming or any other State at the behest of anyone in Georgia or Wyoming or any other State and interfere with contractual arrangements already entered into between farmers and laborers, and use Federal funds to lure laborers away by offering higher wages for Federal employment. Nothing in the joint resolution is consistent with any aspect of peonage. The whole theory of the measure is that the county extension agent knows more about the farm labor within his county than does anyone else, and that he should have some control over all parts of the program as it applies to his county.

It might be said that we are wrecking the program because we require the Administrator, whether he wishes to do so

or not, to allocate at least \$13,500,000 to the county agents and the State extension services. It might be said that under section 2 of the joint resolution there might be a program which would result in recruiting laborers from one county, and then having someone go into another county and offer the workers in that county a little more money, and move them out, under Federal funds, although it is true that in the joint resolution funds are provided for moving laborers into some county or counties.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that it has always been my understanding that the agricultural extension services and agricultural county agents of a State carry on work which is primarily educational. I am wondering why it is that the committee has written into the joint resolution a mandatory provision, as appears on page 6, that the Administrator shall apportion a specific amount to the State extension services for the purpose of handling transient labor. As the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia stated a while ago, the entire program is under the supervision of the Administrator; and, as I further understood the Senator to say, the Administrator is to be permitted to select any agency he desires in order to carry on the work. Should that be the case, why make it mandatory that the Administrator must employ the State agricultural extension services in order to carry on the work?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I may say that in the subcommittee I held exactly the same view as that which the Senator from Louisiana has expressed, but I happened to be the only member of the subcommittee to entertain that view.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. As soon as I finish discussing this point I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

The evidence showed that the State extension services had already set up their programs, and already had people out mobilizing the high-school boys and girls and undertaking to locate in the small towns laborers with a farm background. Therefore, an overwhelming majority of the committee felt that, insofar as the mobilization and placement of farm labor within the counties and within the States was concerned, it should be made mandatory that the Administrator should utilize the services of the county agents and of the State extension services.

Mr. ELLENDER. Suppose the Administrator were to find that that plan does not work. Would he not run short of funds? In other words, he could not use the money for any other purpose, could he?

It strikes me that the joint resolution should be amended so as not to make it obligatory on the Administrator to spend not less than \$13,500,000 or more than \$20,000,000 in that way.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I must say that, although in the committee I agreed with the Senator's view, I do not think he has correctly interpreted the language. The joint resolution requires

that the Administrator shall apportion the money, but he is not required to spend it. The requirement is that he shall apportion at least \$13,500,000 of it.

Mr. ELLENDER. If he did not apportion it, he could not use it for any other purpose; is not that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, he could not.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I had in mind. The joint resolution is specific in that respect; on page 6, line 15, provision is made that—

The Administrator shall apportion among the several States, on the basis of need, not less than \$13,500,000 and not more than \$20,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I agree with the statement the Senator has just made. But a few minutes ago the Senator stated that the Administrator would have to spend the money through the State extension services. I was pointing out that he would not have to spend it. He would not have to spend it at all. He must apportion it to them; but if he were not satisfied with the administration of it, he would not have to pay it to the extension services. There is nothing in the joint resolution which would force the Administrator to pay the money to the State extension services.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is there any language in the resolution which would enable the Administrator to utilize the facilities of the United States Employment Service?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes. It is contemplated that the United States Employment Service will take quite a large part in the program. For example, the State of New York has already passed a State law under which the United States Employment Service and the county agents and representatives of various farm groups have set up a committee which will receive some of the funds.

The Senator will see that local areas are to be permitted to enter into agreements with any private or public agency to perform any part of the work; and it is contemplated that the United States Employment Service will receive a certain amount of the funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us assume that a certain amount of money is apportioned to the State of Maine. Could any of the money be used to transport laborers from Maine into New Hampshire?

Mr. RUSSELL. It could be; yes. However, a State extension service is not going to do anything like that, of course.

Mr. ELLENDER. On page 7, line 2, I notice that the extension service can pay, among other things, for the—

transportation, supervision, subsistence, protection, health, and medical and burial services, and shelter for such workers and their families and necessary personal property.

That language does not indicate that the labor must be, within their own States; the funds could be used to send labor outside of their jurisdiction or vice versa. There is no limitation as to what can be done.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should simply like to remark that I cannot imagine any State director of ex-

tension spending his money to ship his labor outside of his State, to some other State. He might do it, but I cannot imagine it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not attempting to argue that point. I am trying to find out how the money may be spent. During this emergency I can imagine many cases where the extension service of one State would find it advantageous to enter into an agreement with the extension service of another State to exchange labor services in saving the crops of their respective States. All crops do not mature at the same time. I desired to make it certain that it was the intention of Congress to permit the use of the funds to transport labor out as well as in a State. Under the measure as now written the funds could be used in such a manner, could they not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; if there were such a revolution in the ordinary processes of human nature, he could do it, but I do not think any one other than a person in some institution would be likely to do such a thing.

It is contemplated that a State extension service director could bring persons from some other State into his State. Of course, we give the State extension service director of any given State every power that we give to the directors of State extension services of other States. They all have the same power.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us suppose that the State director for Maine desired to have some labor come from Massachusetts to Maine. Under the measure as now written, could he pay all the expenses incidental to bringing that labor from Massachusetts to Maine?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; he could do so, so far as transportation and subsistence expenses were concerned. He could pay all the expenses of bringing the labor from Massachusetts into his State; and it is contemplated that the directors will do so.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will pardon me, I promised first to yield to the Senator from Arizona, and then will yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to comment on the issue raised by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. The matter of the difficulty of bringing in labor was pointed out. I should like to make the point that the difficulty has been, not that the Department of Agriculture or the Manpower Commission have been too ready to admit laborers from other countries, they have not been quick enough to admit them.

I desire to call the attention of the Senator from West Virginia to the fact that my State responded to the request of the Secretary of Agriculture to plant American-Egyptian cotton or long-staple cotton. At the request of the Department, my State increased the acreage of long-staple cotton from 65,000 acres in 1940 to 127,000 acres in 1942. There was an implied promise that aid would be given by the Government to pick that long-staple cotton. There was an implied promise that aid would be given to the people of California and

other States to help them when they responded to the request of the Department of Agriculture to plant the crops which are needed in the war program.

I submit, Mr. President, that long-staple cotton is needed in the war program today, and needed badly. Because we responded to the appeal which was made, there was a shortage of workers in Arizona. The Senator from California [Mr. Downey] and I went to Arizona and California and conducted a hearing in the month of November last year. We found that the people of the State of Arizona and the people of the State of California were desperate in their attempt to get laborers to harvest their crops and pick the long-staple cotton needed by the War Department.

That is the situation which we found, not only in regard to long-staple cotton, but in regard to the dairy and other products of our State. Dairymen were compelled to sell cows for beef purposes because they could not get laborers. They could not get laborers to save their feed. That was the general situation, without going into detail, which we found in the State of Arizona and in the State of California. There was a general farm-labor shortage.

About the first of March of this year I went back to the State of Arizona to find out just what had happened to that program. In March, which is the planting season for long-staple cotton, I saw with my own eyes, fields where not a lock of the previous crop had been picked. The ground was as white as the stalks. That cotton is needed in the war program.

In the month of October I had called upon the Manpower Commission and the United States Employment Agency and asked about the importation of Mexican labor to pick the long-staple cotton. They responded that we had plenty of domestic labor. They were going to import labor from other States to pick the cotton, but it was not done. I asked, "Where is the labor about which you are talking?" The answer which I finally received was that some professor in Oklahoma had testified that on October 1 there would be 100,000 workers available to send to the western area; but on October 1 they did not come, and they never came.

Let me say to the Senator from West Virginia that if there is a surplus of farm labor in West Virginia or in any other State, we will welcome it with open arms in Arizona. I hope that he will not vote against this bill and thereby prevent the Government of the United States from getting long-staple cotton picked after it has been planted, because it is proposed to import labor from another country.

Mr. President, this is a serious problem. The farmer is facing a serious manpower shortage, and has faced it throughout the past year. The people of my State have suffered. We hear much talk about how much money the farmers are making. Some of them have made money; but I can point to farmers in the State of Arizona who have lost money in the year 1942.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think I still have the floor. I am glad to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What has become of the farm labor in the Senator's State which makes it necessary to import so much farm labor?

Mr. McFARLAND. I will gladly answer that question. In the first place, our farm laborers have responded to the call of their country and have gone into the military service. In the second place, they have responded to the call of industry. They have gone to work in the construction of large training bases, Japanese relocation camps, and war industries. We cannot get them back, because they are making more money elsewhere. They responded because they were offered more money elsewhere.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What will become of the laborers whom it is proposed to import?

Mr. McFARLAND. The machinery proposed to be established by the joint resolution would keep them there as long as their services were needed. As I understand, if we go to the expense of importing them, they will be kept there until their job is finished, or for the length of time they agree to stay.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] asked why it is proposed to give this job to the Extension Service. One of the reasons is the dissatisfaction with the Farm Security Administration. They did not get the desired results last year. That is stating it frankly and honestly. The farmers lost money because those agencies did not do the job. While some good was accomplished, they did not handle the situation satisfactorily to the farmers.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate the kind consideration of the able Senator in charge of the joint resolution. I have not had much time to study the Senate committee amendment to the measure as it passed the House, but it occurs to me that complete control of the funds and the program would be placed in the hands of the Food Administrator, who is Mr. Davis. To that extent I assume it would be taken away from the Secretary of Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture, or the remaining part of the Department which he controls. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is my understanding. The Executive order of March 26, 1943, confers on Mr. Davis all the powers which the Secretary of Agriculture has heretofore had in dealing with this problem. It also places under his direct supervision the operations of certain bureaus in the Department, including the Extension Service.

Mr. McNARY. Under the Executive order, the Extension Service goes to Mr. Davis.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. It is no longer under the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Executive order undoubtedly transfers from the Secre-

tary of Agriculture the powers which he has heretofore exercised over the Federal Extension Service.

Mr. McNARY. Is it not the opinion of the very able Senator that the amendment which has been proposed by the Senate committee would centralize the power in the Administrator, as against the House version, which would lodge the authority largely in the extension service in the States?

Mr. RUSSELL. Very frankly, that is what the committee undertook to do.

Mr. McNARY. That is what I thought. A few moments ago distinguished Senators thought that this was a decentralization measure. I think the effect of it would be a high degree of centralization.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was referring to the operations of the Administrator within the States. I invite the attention of the Senator to section 2. The able Senator has undoubtedly read it. No Senator has a quicker grasp of legislation than has the Senator from Oregon. He will see that the State extension service would have almost unlimited control over the funds allocated to the States for the recruitment and placement of labor within the States.

Mr. McNARY. I recall the work which was done in the States last year. Parenthetically, let me say that I favor State supervision, whenever possible, as opposed to Federal supervision. The Extension Service, in cooperation with the United States Employment Service, worked very satisfactorily, and this year a great many of the States favored the joint cooperative effort of those two agencies rather than a centralization in the office of the Food Administrator. Did the committee give thought and consideration to that question?

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee did; and the committee sought to effectuate that very idea in section 2. The committee so worded the amendment that \$20,000,000 of this money, if spent at all, must be spent through the State extension services and such agencies as they desire to enlist to assist them.

Mr. McNARY. "Such agencies", which omits specifically the Federal agency.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; if the Senator will read the language—

Mr. McNARY. I am not as familiar with the language as is the able Senator; but is it not true that it is proposed to work entirely with the extension services in the States through the Food Administrator, omitting, so far as possible, the activities and cooperation of the United States Employment Service?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. The hearings on the bill, which were exceedingly interesting, showed that the several States had different systems. The State of New York, for example, was represented before the committee. The State extension director appeared and outlined in some detail the plan which had been adopted in the State of New York for cooperation between the State extension forces and the United States Employment Service. It is contemplated that the State extension services will work in the closest harmony with the United States Employment Service. They are given power, as the Senator will see on line 14, page 7

of the joint resolution. The following language appears:

Such extension services may enter into agreements with other public and private agencies and individuals and utilize the facilities and services of such agencies and individuals in carrying out the purposes of this section.

So far as it was brought to the attention of the committee—and we heard, directly or indirectly, from nearly all the State extension services—I believe that without exception they plan to work in close harmony with the United States Employment Service.

Mr. McNARY. If the joint resolution should become an act, I hope that may prove to be the fact.

I observe that the increase is from \$26,000,000 to \$40,000,000. Will the Senator tell me why the Senate committee saw fit to alter and modify in many respects the House provisions by the insertion of the Senate committee amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will be frank and say to the Senator from Oregon that some of the members of the committee, including the Senator from Georgia, had a great deal of difficulty in determining exactly what the joint resolution, as passed by the House, meant.

Mr. McNARY. Did the Senator experience that difficulty with respect to the Senate committee amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, as the Senator well knows, anyone who has any connection with the writing of a law knows what he has in mind, and he thinks it is covered by his bill, whether it is written into the bill or not. The Senator is aware of that. Apparently the author of the House joint resolution knew exactly what it was designed to do. But from my reading of it, it appeared there was considerable conflict in its language. There were a number of limitations, such as that read by the Senator from Wyoming, whereby the commissioner of agriculture in any State would have the right to forbid the movement of any labor without a State. There was language which provided that in this interstate movement of labor the Extension Service should work with the United States Employment Service, and it said that this work should be done under general rules and regulations to be issued by the Federal office of the Extension Service of the United States Employment Service.

It occurred to me that while one bureau in the Department of Labor had just as much authority to write rules and regulations as a bureau in the Department of Agriculture, they might have some difficulty in ever agreeing on rules and regulations for the interstate movement of labor.

There were a number of other provisions in the joint resolution as passed by the House which were just as confusing to me, because I thought that someone somewhere should have final authority. It is said that the United States Extension Service and the United States Employment Service should write rules and regulations, without saying who should have the right to reconcile any differences between the agencies. My obser-

vation convinces me that under such circumstances we would not be likely to have any rules and regulations.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator knows my profound objection to an appropriation bill containing a legislative provision. The objection is as acute in this instance as when legislative amendments are proposed to regular annual current appropriation bills. I believe this is in violation of the rules of the Senate, to the extent that it is an attempt to write legislation into an appropriation bill, though not one of the annual appropriation bills. Of course, I am not going to raise the point, but, as the Senator knows, it is a practice which I deplore most profoundly.

I merely wish to add this inquiry at this time: How many witnesses appeared before the committee, and how general were the hearings?

Mr. RUSSELL. The hearings were very extensive. They embraced 283 printed pages. We had before us representatives of all the farm organizations, including some I had never before heard of. Of course, the committee was a deficiency subcommittee, as the Senator is aware. We had farm organizations which appeared before the committee who never found their way before the committee on agricultural appropriations.

There appeared before the committee the newly appointed Administrator, and the directors of the extension services of four or five States. We had before us the Secretary of Agriculture, in addition to a representative of the Federal Farm Bureau Federation, the Grange, and other farm organizations, as well as individuals who represented States and groups. We had a very wide variety of witnesses. In fact, it was one of the most thorough hearings I have seen.

Mr. McNARY. Did the farm organizations to which the Senator has referred approve of the Senate committee's amendment, or did they not express their preference for the House provisions?

Mr. RUSSELL. We may as well be frank about it—

Mr. McNARY. We always are.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Farm Bureau Federation endorsed the House joint resolution as written. When some of the complications of the House joint resolution were pointed out to them, they came in with a great many separate amendments which they proposed to the measure as it passed the House. The committee then undertook to write a complete substitute. Mr. Goss, of the Grange, and representatives of other farm organizations, expressed some doubts as to the workability of the House joint resolution.

I will say to the Senator from Oregon that as far as the farm organizations are concerned, and particularly the Farm Bureau Federation, the pending joint resolution embraces more of their ideas than mine, because I opposed very vigorously some of my colleagues on the committee who supported the views of the Farm Bureau, and I lost in committee. I would say, therefore, it is more of a Farm Bureau measure than anything else. Some of the members of the

subcommittee were very anxious to have the ideas of the Farm Bureau written into the joint resolution.

Mr. McNARY. Did the committee have before it a representative of the United States Employment Service?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I do not think there was a representative of the United States Employment Service before the committee.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I hesitate to be provincial at any time, but in this instance I may state that I think this work was carried on splendidly in my own State last year under the United States Employment Service, and I was rather hopeful that the same service would be rendered this year, and continued under the same administration. I was curious to know if the committee requested a representative of this very reputable and competent Service to come before it and have him express the views of the Service.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I did not invite them.

Mr. McNARY. The pending joint resolution is really the Food Administrator's measure, with the Extension Service assigned to him to administer it, and somewhat sanctioned by the farm organizations.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that it certainly is not a measure of the Food Administrator. The Food Administrator wrote a letter to the committee very vigorously protesting against several provisions in the joint resolution, and earnestly insisting that they be stricken from the measure. I am not certain whether he approves any substantial part of the joint resolution or not, but the Senator has stated that it is his measure. To make his position clear, he wrote me a letter which very vigorously protested against a number of provisions in the joint resolution and earnestly urged the committee to strike them out, or change several of the provisions.

Mr. McNARY. Was the joint resolution reported unanimously from the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. RUSSELL. No opposition to the joint resolution was expressed in the committee. As I recall, the junior Senator from Massachusetts—though he is in the Chamber and can make his own statement—stated that he had no desire to oppose reporting the joint resolution, but he reserved the right to oppose any portion of it when it got to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Maine also indicated his opposition to some features of the measure, as I did.

Mr. RUSSELL. As I recall, the Senator from Maine was opposed to the idea of legislating and appropriating in the same bill. He expressed the same dissent to that expressed by the Senator from Massachusetts. I do not like the idea of legislating in the Appropriations Committee; but what was the committee to do? A measure came to the Senate from the House of Representatives; it contained legislative provisions and appropriations, and was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and we were compelled to handle it. There is

nothing new in such procedure. Year after year we have taken up bills containing provisions which are legislative, and also appropriation items to carry on the agencies of the Government. There never has been any basic legislation affecting the N. Y. A. before any standing committee of the Senate. It has always been handled on a year-to-year basis by the Committee on Appropriations. For the W. P. A., which was in existence for some years, there never was any basic act, and no standing committee of the Senate ever saw a bill relating to the powers and functions of the W. P. A. It was handled on a year-to-year basis by the Appropriations Committee. While I think it is much better to have a legislative provision providing for appropriations rather than to write a bill and the appropriation all in the same measure, certainly the committee could not refuse to have anything to do with this very important problem of attempting to supplement the decreasing farm labor in this country, merely to take the time to decide what committee should have handled the bill and how it should have been handled. It came to us from the House of Representatives, and we have done the best we could with it, both in respect to the legislative and appropriation features.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I feel that it may be appropriate to say that in my service on the Appropriations Committee I do not remember an occasion when more full and complete study was given to a proposal than was given to this measure. I think the Senator from Georgia should be complimented on the manner in which he conducted the hearings and the executive sessions of the committee at which the text of the joint resolution was discussed. The problem presented to us was, without question, one of the most difficult which has been presented to the Appropriations Committee for some time. We had this great national need for agricultural labor; we had a joint resolution which came to the Senate from the House, written partly upon the floor and partly in the committee, which raised many questions of emotional disagreement as well as a factual disagreement. The Senator from Georgia was instrumental in having legislative draftsmen present. When the Food Administrator was appointed the committee adjourned in order to give him an opportunity to come to Washington to present his point of view to the committee. After that was done, the Food Administrator was asked to suggest to the committee language which he felt might serve the purpose for which the Food administrator had been selected. He did that, and, as the Senator from Georgia has said, that suggestion was not accepted by the subcommittee. We had before us the measure as it passed the other House, a tentative draft which was prepared under the direction of the Senator from Georgia by the legislative draftsman, another draft which was prepared by the legislative experts of the Department of Agriculture at the suggestion of the new Food Adminis-

trator, and a draft which was again prepared under the direction of the Senator from Georgia. The full committee worked all over these drafts and produced the result which is now before the Senate.

As I said a moment ago, I think the Senator from Georgia is to be complimented on what he did. I did not agree with it in its entirety, and I made a motion in the committee to strike out section 4 (a). I intend to make such a motion again, so that the Senate may pass upon it, but, by and large, I think this measure has been given careful and constructive consideration by the committee.

Now, Mr. President, may I make a parliamentary inquiry? I ask what is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then a perfecting amendment is now in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An amendment to the committee amendment is in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to make one more brief statement; I have not yet yielded the floor. Naturally, I would not want to interrupt the Senator from Wyoming, because he was kind enough to say some very nice things about me. Handling the joint resolution was the most thankless job I ever had to perform, and, in a few moments, I shall be glad to have the Senate take it over and do as it sees fit.

Mr. BYRD and Mr. HOLMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Georgia has made a very able and complete statement concerning the pending measure. There are several questions I should like to ask him. Did I understand him to say, in response to a question by the Senator from Oregon, that this measure removes the Agricultural Extension Service entirely from the control of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. RUSSELL. The joint resolution does not affect that at all. The President, by Executive order, transferred the Extension Service and placed it under the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution. The joint resolution does not affect that. It was moved, as I understand, by Executive order of the President.

Mr. BYRD. There are two items to the joint resolution, one an appropriation not exceeding \$20,000,000 to be expended through the State agricultural extension services, and then another \$20,000,000 to be expended by the Food Administrator. Would it not be possible to coordinate the activities of these two agencies, as they would be doing the same work? The first, as I understand, will do the work within the States, moving the workers within the borders of the States?

Mr. RUSSELL. Largely recruiting them and transporting any necessary to move.

Mr. BYRD. And the second will move them from State to State? Will not these two organizations conflict with each other by doing the same work?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think they can. I may say to the Senator that I endeavored in the hearings on the joint resolution to make sure they would not.

Mr. BYRD. Both of them have the same powers and authority—the power to recruit and transport, and so forth, and so on. I do not see how the two can operate without some conflict and duplication of effort, because they have exactly the same powers, whether the laborers are moved within a State by the agency of the Agricultural Extension Service or are moved without a State by the other agency.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think there can be any conflict even though there is a spelling out of powers. Both agencies are effective, the State extension service as well as the other for interstate and international movements, because all are under the supervision of the Administrator.

Mr. BYRD. Is it the purpose of the Food Administrator, as the Senator understands, to designate some agency of the Government to operate under section 3?

Mr. RUSSELL. As I understand, he is going to use the extension agencies of the Government to operate under section 3. He is going to use the Federal Extension Service, and he intends to use the United States Employment Service. He will, undoubtedly, use some features of the Farm Security program camps which are already in existence.

Mr. BYRD. What features will he use, so far as the Senator is aware, of the Farm Security program?

Mr. RUSSELL. As I understand, the Administrator intends to see that the camps which the Farm Security Administration has already established for migratory labor will be operated under the provisions of this measure under his direction. He may use some facilities of the Farm Security Administration. I want to point out to the Senator from Virginia that all the drafts of the joint resolution had given both the Extension Service and the Administration the power to construct additional farm-labor camps, but, on my motion, the committee struck out that authority and there is now no power to construct any new or additional migratory labor camps.

Mr. BYRD. The joint resolution gives authority over "transportation, supervision, subsistence, protection, health and medical and burial services, and shelter for such workers and their families and necessary personal property." Would not that give the power to construct camps?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; because of the language in clause 3, 2 (a). If the Senator will look at that clause—I tried to point it out to the Senator, but evidently he did not understand me—he will note that the word "construction" was omitted. It was the first word, and the clause read "construction, lease, repair,

alteration, and operation of labor supply centers." The word "construction" was stricken out. The Administrator only has power to lease, repair, alter, and operate labor supply centers.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator does not think, then, since the joint resolution provides for shelter, that it would authorize the Administrator to build camps?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not.

Mr. BYRD. I do not see how the workers could be sheltered unless some houses or equipment were provided.

Mr. RUSSELL. This refers to the furnishing of loans or grants for shelters. It means that he could rent a house for workers or he could give them two or three dollars when they first land and before they have obtained jobs to enable them to stay in a boarding house a day or so, but it certainly does not relate to any construction. The word "construction," giving power to construct, was expressly stricken from the bill.

Mr. BYRD. Has the Senator any information as to whether the Farm Security Administration will have power over these workers? They have had in the past.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think I have some information on that, because that was practically the sole subject of discussion before the subcommittee for some 3 or 4 days. As nearly as I can understand the situation, the Farm Security Administration is to have absolutely no policy-making power to deal with any feature of this program.

Mr. BYRD. From whom did the Senator obtain that assurance?

Mr. RUSSELL. From the Secretary of Agriculture, from the Administrator of Food Distribution and Production, and from the extension services, which will handle the matter within the States; and they are the only people who have any power to control the expenditure of the funds.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator says he obtained the assurance from the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution. Did he obtain directly from Mr. Davis the assurance that he did not intend to use the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I did not, because I think it would be very foolish if he did not utilize some of those connected with the Farm Security Administration. There are agents of that organization in nearly every county in the United States, and if the authorities can use those agents in the program without the necessity of hiring new men, I think it would be very desirable to do so. I said that it was stated that no one in the Farm Security Administration would have any power to make any policies in the program.

Mr. BYRD. They would only use the camps and such other facilities as the Farm Security Administration now has?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. In the past millions of dollars have been spent on those camps.

Mr. BYRD. Would the Farm Security Administration operate the camps?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Administrator could let them operate them if he wished

to, but if I understood Mr. Davis' statement—and I am not quoting him verbatim—I took his position to be that he did not intend to use the Farm Security Administration to formulate policies. My view is that Mr. Davis would utilize an employee of the Farm Security Administration who is already employed in the field, rather than employ a new one. He would be very foolish not to do that. Such employees are not going to be discharged between now and the 1st of July, and if he can avail himself of their services, I think he should do so.

Mr. BYRD. Is the Senator convinced in his own mind that Mr. Davis will not use the Farm Security Administration to the extent of it having equal influence?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am absolutely convinced of that, and I think every other member of the subcommittee who attended the hearings will give expression to the same opinion.

Mr. BYRD. There is one other question I should like to ask the Senator. At the bottom of page 6 the word "recruiting" is used. Who would fix the price of labor when the labor is recruited to go to another county or another State?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will turn to the provision on page 10, commencing in line 25, he will find a feature of the bill as it passed the House which caused us more difficulty than practically any other section. The language came to us from the House as follows:

That no part of the funds herein appropriated nor any of the funds hitherto appropriated or made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the recruitment, transportation, and placement of farm labor shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective bargaining requirements or union membership with respect to any agricultural labor.

And so forth. It occurred to some of the members of the committee that if that language meant anything at all, it meant that it was not permissible even to go from one county to another and tell a man what wage he would receive if he were to move to another county to work. We undertook to amend it, particularly with respect to the agreement already entered into with the Mexican Government, by adding the following language:

Except with respect to workers imported into the United States from a foreign country and then only to the extent required to comply with agreements with the government of such foreign country.

We then added the following proviso:

Provided, That nothing herein contained shall prevent the expenditure of such funds in connection with the negotiation of agreements with employers of agricultural workers which may provide that prevailing wage rates shall be paid for particular crops and areas involved and that shelter shall be provided for such workers.

In other words, under the language as it was construed by at least some members of the committee, it would not be possible to go to a worker in the State of

Kentucky and say, "If you go up into Virginia and pick apples, we will give you so much a box," or "If you go to the Eastern Shore of Maryland and gather beans, we will pay you so much a crate." We did amend it so that they could be assured that they would get the going wage, whatever it was, whether it was for picking cotton, or whatever the work was.

Mr. BYRD. I presume that process would be followed so that if a group in a certain section of the country wanted labor, they would notify the workers what they would pay?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. And the price would not be determined by either one of the organizations concerned in the pending measure, as I understand?

Mr. RUSSELL. The man who wanted the labor would tell the people he was asking to supply the labor what those who wanted labor were willing to pay, and if the laborers were willing to work for that amount, he could get them.

Mr. HOLMAN and Mr. BUSHFIELD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLMAN. I request that the Members of the Senate turn to page 11 and observe, in lines 8 and 9, the words "workers imported into the United States from a foreign country."

I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia to make an explanation for the Record, for the benefit of those who, like me, are jealous of breaking down the restrictions on immigration from foreign lands, so far as they relate to permanent residence.

I have two points in mind: First, that the language of the pending measure is ample to provide for the return of all workers permitted to enter the country under the joint resolution. The second point is that no language in the joint resolution would permit an influx of immigrants from all over the world in violation of existing immigration laws.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Oregon was a member of the subcommittee which conducted the hearings, and I am sure that all the members of the subcommittee will bear testimony that the Senator from Oregon was most diligent in undertaking to establish that no person, alien-born, should be permitted to enter this country and take up permanent residence by virtue of any of the powers granted under the pending measure which might be exercised by any agency. The Senator was responsible for the inquiries being directed to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, as well as to the officials who would administer the proposed law, to make certain that all due precautions would be taken to see that such immigrants were returned to the countries of their origin as soon as they had concluded their contracts. That is certainly the intention of the committee, and I hope no person will be permitted to take up permanent residence in this country by

virtue of admission under the terms of the joint resolution.

Mr. HOLMAN. I was well aware of that interpretation and that of the committee, but I wanted the record made. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield now to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, in lines 15 and 16 on page 11 appears the language "and that shelter shall be provided for such workers." The Senator comes from a part of the country distant from where I have my residence. I am quite familiar with farming conditions throughout the Middle West, and I do not believe there is any place in the Middle West, in what are called the Prairie States, where it is necessary to construct shelters and housing for farm laborers. I am wondering whether that fact was taken into consideration by the committee when it raised the appropriation from \$26,000,000 to \$40,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; that fact was taken into consideration. Not a dime of the money is to be used for the construction of shelters. If the Senator will refer to the language in lines 15 and 16 he will see that it merely means that before a laborer can be transported from one State to another it is permissible to tell the laborer that he will have some kind of shelter when he gets to where he is to perform his work.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Then the agency would not undertake to force upon the producer or the farmer the necessity of constructing new shelters?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no. The word "shelter" was used merely to avoid the confusion which has resulted from the efforts of the Farm Security Administration to fix a certain standard of housing throughout the country. That is the reason the word "shelter" was employed in drafting the bill.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I call attention to the hearing had before the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate on the subject of food supply of the United States. That hearing has been going on most of the winter. I recall very definitely the testimony of Mr. Chandler, of Florida, who represented the vegetable and fruit growers of Florida. He stated in his testimony, which appears in the record of the hearings, that he asked the Department of Agriculture for additional laborers, and the Department undertook to provide them, but when the laborers were sent there the agent in charge of the contingent of laborers rejected Mr. Chandler's housing, or the cabins which he had provided, which he had used for 20 years, and to which no one had ever previously objected. So the agent moved his crowd of workers into an adjacent open field, and housed them in tents, and told Mr. Chandler that he could not have those laborers because they were not provided the proper kind of housing.

I wish to supplement what the Senator from Arizona said concerning the situation in Arizona. Very interesting testimony concerning that subject was taken during the hearings to which I have referred. Mr. Abbott, representing the cotton growers of three or four States,

said that at the solicitation of the Department of Agriculture they increased their acreage by 60 percent. He said those cotton farmers had to have 20,000 or 21,000 additional laborers.

The Department said the laborers would be furnished to them. All the Department ever did furnish was approximately 1,900 laborers, and the Department undertook to set up a standard contract of labor and wages by the hour, instead of by the pound, as cotton is picked. The thing is in a mess; and, as the distinguished Senator from Arizona said, that long-staple cotton still lies in the fields, practically a total loss. The cotton growers of Arizona alone lost ten million or eleven million dollars by the failure of the laborers the Department sent there.

I should like to read what the Graham County farmers' organization said about the laborers which were sent to them, as being of interest in connection with the present discussion:

We found a large portion of these workers were unfit for any kind of labor, namely, persons in the last stages of TB, who were told that Arizona was a mecca for such diseases, and that if they could get out there they might effect a cure, even if they couldn't work; that they would be given free medical care and attention and otherwise be taken care of. There were active cases of syphilis, confirmed alcoholics, and people choked up with asthma, who, by their own admission, had not done a day's work in 2 years; women expecting to become mothers any minute, men over 70 years of age, and jailbirds with long prison records, as well as old, worn-out prostitutes.

That is the type of laborers the Farm Security Administration furnished the State of Arizona.

I read what Mr. Abbott said in his testimony about this kind of an appropriation, and with this I conclude my remarks in connection with the question:

Now, on coming back here, I find that they have asked this same group who blocked us last year, asked for sixty-five or seventy million dollars. I guess that is to do the same thing to other people that they did to us.

I want to register before this committee a very definite protest on the part of my people, and also myself as an American citizen and a farmer, against this Congress appropriating \$17,000,000 for the construction of camps which are not needed. Every farmer has room for labor, and in only a few instances will it be found necessary to establish small, rolling, gathering camps for the harvesting of berries.

Of course, the distinguished Senator says the matter of construction of camps has been eliminated from the bill, but I wanted to bring to the attention of the Senate the testimony which came before our subcommittee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, we received testimony practically to the same effect as that mentioned by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. There is, however, a difference in the several areas of the country, particularly in some of the vegetable and fruit areas, and if some kind of camps are not provided it is very difficult indeed to handle the labor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say a word in addition to what the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] has stated regarding the testimony of Mr. Chandler from Florida. Mr. Chandler did come before us and say that his buildings had been condemned, and that the labor that was secured through Farm Security Administration was unsatisfactory. However, at a later date—and I am not sure the Senator from South Dakota was present—Mr. Baldwin, of the Farm Security Administration, came before the committee and stated that they had not condemned any of Mr. Chandler's buildings; that they had furnished him with 20 hands, 2 of whom had been returned as unsatisfactory, but he quite emphatically denied that they had condemned the buildings.

We also had, as the Senator from South Dakota said, the testimony from Mr. Abbott, of Arizona. I have heard no word from the Farm Security Administration or from anyone else contradicting his testimony. So possibly there is more basis for that complaint than there is for the one from Florida, which was denied by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in a colloquy had a few moments ago with the able Senator in charge of the bill, I asked him the question what the attitude of the farm representatives was with respect to the House bill and the Senate amendments, and he answered, as always, with clarity and frankness. Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the Farm Bureau Federation, a short while ago sent me a letter regarding that organization's attitude, which at this time I ask unanimous consent to have read by the clerk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read the letter.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

APRIL 8, 1943.

SENATOR CHARLES L. McNARY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McNARY: In order that there may be no misunderstanding of the position of the American Farm Bureau Federation with respect to House Joint Resolution 96, I wish to advise that we believe the provisions of this bill as passed by the House, together with the amendments which we submitted to the Senate Appropriations Committee, constitute a more workable and effective program than the bill reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Our board gave this whole matter extended consideration during its recent meeting in Washington and, after careful study, strongly recommended that the Extension Service be given this responsibility with authority to utilize the facilities of the Employment Service or other agencies through cooperative agreements.

Under the plan which we have recommended, and which is embodied in the House bill, the Food Administrator has ample authority to supervise the administration of this program, since he must approve all programs and projects and the expenditure of all funds under the terms of existing cooperative agreements of the Extension Service with the Department of Agriculture and under the terms of the President's Executive order creating the Food Administration.

Very truly yours,

EDW. A. O'NEAL,
President.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am always very happy when I can be in agreement with the distinguished head of the Farm Bureau Federation on any legislative matter, but, of course, I realize that I have a responsibility to the people over and beyond any responsibility to the Farm Bureau Federation. I wish to say again that, in my judgment, the bill which the Farm Bureau Federation asked the committee to support and report was absolutely unworkable and that it could not have functioned at all, because it undertook to apply the rules of a matching provision in the Smith-Lever Act to this bill, in connection with which all the funds are Federal funds. While I should like to be in agreement with Mr. O'Neal, I want to say again that I think he is as far wrong as he could possibly be and that, if we were to pass the bill which the Farm Bureau Federation wrote for the House and succeeded in inducing the House to pass, we might as well throw the \$26,100,000 out the window, because we would not be able to get one laborer from anywhere and make him available to any farmer in the country.

There is one other provision of the joint resolution which I desire to call to the attention of the Senate, and then I shall be through. I wish to point out that I have not utilized all the time which has passed while I have been on my feet. I desire particularly to call the attention of the Senate to subsection (f) on page 13, because it is a provision which affects other legislation, and I think the Senate should be fully apprised of the provisions of the subsection.

It was brought to the attention of the subcommittee that there was in the country a large reservoir of labor of both men and women past 65 years of age who now, on account of rules in various States, are receiving sums by way of old-age assistance. A great many such persons have a farm background; and, while they do not have the physical strength of the younger farm workers, they have the experience and the knowledge which are so vitally needed today on the farms, where high-school boys and girls are attempting to do work which is somewhat technical in nature. There is a rule or provision of law, or it may be a regulation of the Social Security Board—I am not quite clear which it is—which provides that if any person earns any money while receiving old-age assistance, that fact shall be taken into consideration in determining whether such person is in need. In many of the States the old people who have undertaken to relieve the farm labor shortage by doing a little work found that they would be taken off the old-age assistance rolls and would be denied the amounts they were receiving by way of old-age assistance. Naturally, as soon as word of that got around, the others were very slow to accept employment on the farms.

The subsection does say that hereafter, for the duration of the war and for 6 months thereafter, there shall not be a

Federal rule that the funds received for performing agricultural labor shall be considered in determining old-age assistance need. That is a matter affecting laws which have not been under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee, and I thought I should call the matter especially to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. President, let me say that the joint resolution falls far short of being perfect. There are in it a great many provisions of which I do not approve. However, it represents approximately 2 or 3 weeks of very earnest effort on the part of the subcommittee. We believe it will work. We believe that the county agents and State extension services will be able to mobilize sufficient high-school boys and girls and other resources of labor within the States, in conjunction with labor which is to be brought in from outside the States, to enable us to harvest this year's crops. We are not going to have adequate farm labor, and that which we do have will suffer for lack of actual experience in the very highly technical business of farming; but by the full utilization of the labor which is available, with the slight back-to-the-farm movement which has been noted lately as those who have rushed off to employment in industry have seen that "all that glistens is not gold" and have encountered the difficulties of rationing and have in their mind's eye gone back to the good old days on the farm when they could have all the butter and all the meat they wished, together with the forces which will be mobilized under the pending joint resolution, the committee believes we should be able to harvest this year's crops, and, with favorable conditions, we can virtually succeed in reaching the goals which have been fixed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. With reference to the statement just made with respect to subsection (f), I offered the amendment in the subcommittee, and the subcommittee accepted the amendment. Later it was redrafted by our drafting service, and was approved by the full committee. Since the committee reported the bill and submitted a report on it, the Social Security authorities have considered the amendment; and the meaning of the amendment is not exactly clear in the minds of some of those who must administer the act.

It is the fear of the Administrator of the Social Security Service—I refer to Governor McNutt—that if the amendment should be adopted in its present form it might provide for an addition to the old-age pension rolls of a substantial number of persons. That was not the intent of the amendment. In order that the intent of the amendment may be made as clear, I desire to offer for the Record the interpretation of the committee with respect to the amendment. I ask that the interpretation be printed

in the Record at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the interpretation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Section 5 (f) provides that compensation earned for agricultural labor shall not be taken into consideration in determining the need of individuals for old-age assistance under title 1 of the Social Security Act. That title now provides for grants-in-aid to the States for old-age assistance, and provides that such grants will be made only with respect to assistance for needy individuals. The purpose of this subsection is to permit recipients of old-age assistance to work as agricultural workers during the war, and for 6 months thereafter, without having such assistance discontinued or reduced.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, if I may proceed for just another moment, let me say that the purpose of the amendment is to permit persons on the old-age pension rolls to accept employment at agricultural labor and to accept remuneration for such labor without in any way altering or changing their status as recipients of old-age assistance.

In order that the amendment may be clarified, I propose the proviso which I send to the desk and ask to have stated for the information of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be stated for the benefit of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

On page 13, at the end of line 22, strike out the period, and add a colon and the following: "Provided, That this subsection (f) shall not be construed to alter or amend any provision of existing law save that during the time mentioned any person receiving old-age assistance shall be entitled to receive remuneration for agricultural labor performed without in any way whatever altering, changing, or modifying his or her status as recipients of old-age assistance."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I think that this clarification proviso covers the point which has been raised by Governor McNutt. Let me say that if the proviso is adopted, along with the statement of intent made by the committee, then if it goes to conference, no doubt Governor McNutt will be called into conference; and if in conference any further change is made in the section or in the clarifying amendment, it will be agreeable so far as I am concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am a member of the subcommittee which considered the bill and, therefore, I feel it

incumbent upon me to make a statement with regard to it. Unfortunately, as so often occurs in the Senate, there was a conflict of duties, and on several occasions I had to be absent from meetings of the subcommittee. Consequently I am not as fully conversant with all the proceedings as I otherwise would be.

For that reason, in the committee I took the position of reserving my right to study the joint resolution further when it came to the floor, and at that time to take any action which I might deem appropriate.

I attended a sufficient number of the meetings of the committee to enable me to bear witness to the splendid work which was done there by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], to say a word of praise for his industry and intelligence, and to express my own belief that no other Member of this body could grasp a problem of this kind better than could he. Whether or not the measure becomes law, certainly the contribution which the Senator from Georgia has made to the subject is noteworthy, and deserves our gratitude.

Of course, the joint resolution also has a tremendously worthy aim which must be approved by every Member of the Senate—the aim of taking practical steps to meet the farm-labor shortage. The aim of trying to move people from areas where there is a surplus of manpower into areas where there is a shortage of manpower is a profoundly appealing objective; but none of those considerations, appealing as they are, mitigate the fact that the joint resolution is full of moot questions of very far-reaching import, involving grave considerations of national policy. I am prepared to concede that the Senator from Georgia and the other members of the subcommittee considered all these questions with the utmost care, and that they conducted the hearings in the most orderly way. However, at the same time, questions of policy and questions of opinion, which are not secondary questions at all, are involved in the joint resolution.

The joint resolution clearly impinges on the question of immigration. I accept the statements which have been made that it would not change the quota system. I do not believe it would; but I am not at all clear in my mind as to the effect which the joint resolution would have on the laws regarding the head tax or what effect it would have on the question of immigrants becoming public charges. I do not know. I do not think anyone knows.

I notice the provision that the gentleman who is to administer the act shall cooperate with the Secretary of State. That brings to mind a picture of both of them working together. Of course, the question of immigration involves a great deal more than the Secretary of State. It involves other departments. It is my understanding that the proposed legislation has never been cleared by the State Department. It certainly brings up the question of treaties and foreign relations.

Another thing which I do not like in the joint resolution is that the money proposed to be appropriated may be dis-

tributed without precept, directive, formula, or yardstick of any kind. I realize that the members of the subcommittee have thought about this, and that they believe that the situation is such that no formula or amendment could be drafted which would meet the needs. However, it is an important consideration with some of us on the committee that there should be such a precept.

I am in doubt as to the effect which the impact of this measure would have on our contract-labor law. I do not say that it would have any. I do not know. However, the more one reads some of these measures the more he wonders.

So while I heartily approve the stated purpose of the joint resolution, and while I pay tribute to the sincerity and intelligence of the Senators who drafted it and worked on it, I believe the proper course to take now would be to refer the joint resolution to a committee, preferably the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I so move, Mr. President.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, is my motion now before the Senate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts, which is a preferential motion.

Mr. LODGE. I move to refer the joint resolution to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is the motion debatable?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is debatable.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to be heard for a few moments on the motion.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I asked the Senator to yield in order to ascertain what he hopes would be accomplished by referring the joint resolution to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has no jurisdiction over the question of immigration which he raises. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has no jurisdiction over the question of foreign affairs which he raises. Why did he select that committee? None of his objections has anything to do with the functions performed by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. LODGE. So far as that is concerned, the Appropriations Committee has nothing to do with those questions, either.

Mr. HAYDEN. We understand that; and that has been explained many times to the Senate, with respect to the W. P. A., the National Youth Administration, and other agencies, as well as in this instance. However, when the House passes a measure which contains both an appropriation and legislation, it must go to the Appropriations Committee. We did not seek it. The joint resolution was handed to us. I am trying to find out why the Senator from Massachusetts

selected the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to meet the objections which he raises, which have nothing to do with the functions of that committee.

Mr. LODGE. The reason I selected the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is that the prime purpose of the joint resolution is to relieve the agricultural situation. I know that I should be very much more severely criticized than I am now being criticized if I were to seek to have the joint resolution referred to the Committee on Immigration or the Committee on Foreign Relations. I can imagine what some Senators might say to me then.

Mr. HAYDEN. In that case our answer would be that neither of those committees would have any occasion to act upon the joint resolution, because it does not affect the immigration laws, and does not affect our foreign relations, as everyone must know who is familiar with the way in which the proposed legislation would operate.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator cannot correctly say that it does not affect our foreign relations because he knows very well that it has to do with the importation of foreign labor and that the joint resolution has not been cleared by the State Department.

Mr. HAYDEN. We had witnesses from the State Department before the committee.

Mr. LODGE. Can the Senator point to anything in writing from the State Department indicating that the Department approves it?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. It was not necessary to obtain a report. All the joint resolution does is, in effect, to provide that the existing agreement made with Mexico by the State Department shall be carried out unless it is hereafter modified.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator knows that there is nothing in the joint resolution which would limit such agreements to Mexico. Such agreements might be made with Venezuela, San Domingo, or any other country.

Mr. HAYDEN. The State Department has approved the two existing agreements. One is with Mexico and the other with the Government of the Bahama Islands. Those agreements stand unless it is desirable to renegotiate them, in which case Mr. Davis is directed to cooperate with the State Department.

I cannot conceive of any purpose the Senator can have in mind in making the motion except to delay relief which the farmers of the Nation need in obtaining labor to take care of crops which are now being put in the ground. Why kill time?

Mr. LODGE. What motive could I have for doing so?

Mr. HAYDEN. Knowing the Senator as I do I cannot understand what his motive could be.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it is unworthy of the Senator from Arizona to make such a statement; and I believe that when he thinks about it a little more he will realize that he did not mean it. He knows perfectly well that no Senator is more desirous than I am of solving this problem. I made it very plain when I

began that I heartily endorse the purpose of the joint resolution, but I am not sure that it would achieve the announced purpose. It does neither the Senator from Arizona nor anyone else any credit to say that I wish to delay bringing relief to the farmer.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I invite the Senator's attention to subdivision (3) on page 10. The Senator spoke of what the State Department thought about the measure. Subdivision (3) on page 10 provides that the Administrator shall cooperate with the Secretary of State in the negotiation or renegotiation of agreements with foreign governments relating to the importation of workers into the United States. That refers to the second half of the joint resolution. Instead of leaving the State Department out of it, it merely enforces the agreement which the State Department has already made and provides for cooperation with the State Department in making any future agreements. Under the circumstances in which we find ourselves, with the necessity for importing workers from other countries, it seems to me that that is the logical, most effective, and most expeditious way of dealing with the subject. The joint resolution does not exclude the State Department, the Department of Agriculture, or any other department, but provides for cooperation.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator does not allege, does he, that that rather peculiar language "to cooperate with the Secretary of State" has been approved by the State Department?

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that it has the entire approval of the State Department. I do not think there was any evidence to that effect. There is none in the hearings; but we were assured that it is entirely satisfactory to the State Department. That is the reason why that particular provision was included.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. My recollection of what was said about this matter in the Committee on Appropriations is that the State Department had not cleared the proposed legislation in any respect. If I may say a word further, reference has been made to an agreement with Mexico. The provision just referred to by the Senator from Tennessee not only relates to existing agreements with Mexico or with any other nation, but gives authority of a dubious character with respect to all negotiations which may hereafter be carried on, or agreements which may hereafter be negotiated.

I do not know what the joint resolution means when it says that the Administrator is authorized to cooperate. My impression is that that is a dilution of the authority of the Secretary of State, and makes the Administrator, to some degree at least, a partner with the Secretary of State in the negotiation and renegotiation of such agreements. I agree with what the Senator from Massachu-

setts has said about this particular provision.

Mr. McKELLAR. It applies solely to the importation of farm workers and that is why reference is made to it. It does not give the Administrator any authority to deal with other agreements, but merely to cooperate with the State Department, and it is perfectly natural and proper that it should.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Because of the fact that the State Department has been brought into the discussion of the pending measure, I should like to point out that in the very unusual efforts made to work out the proposed legislation a joint meeting was held between the members of the Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations of the House Appropriations Committee and six or eight Members of the House who were interested and members of the Senate committee. The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee invited the Secretary of State to attend the meeting. The Secretary of State sent representatives who stated to the joint conference—it does not appear in the hearings because I did not have the proceedings reported due to the fact it was a combined meeting of the two committees—that they had no interest in the measure other than to work with the agency in which the power should finally be delegated in an effort to negotiate these treaties and that they would gladly work with any agency on which power was conferred by Congress to attempt to obtain agricultural labor.

As a matter of fact, the agreements made prior to that time had been negotiated under the auspices of the State Department and were signed by representatives of the Department, attesting to the fact that the Department had had full knowledge of all agreements made, and had participated in making them. There has been no effort made to short-circuit the State Department. The State Department has been consulted, and it has no objections whatever to the pending joint resolution. It went further and stated that it would be happy to work with whatever agency the Congress saw fit to designate in placing responsibility for securing the labor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from Massachusetts has referred to some of the provisions in the joint resolution not being as plain as he would like them to be. What the Senator has said may be true. There may be provisions in the joint resolution which are not as plain as they should be, but there is one thing, Mr. President, which is plain. It is plain to Congress, it is plain to the President, and it is plain to the people of the United States that this Nation needs food. It is plain that our Army needs food, and it is plain that it is time to plant the crops. The farmers of the Nation are entitled to know whether they shall have labor with which to plant their crops and whether they shall have labor to harvest the crops if they shall be planted.

I desire to compliment the distinguished Senator from Georgia for the thoroughness with which he has handled the pending measure, and for the study he has given to it. Mr. President, it is one of the most important pieces of legislation which has come before this session of Congress, because it involves food for our people and food for our Army.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I agree with the statements made by distinguished Senators all along the line. I am very glad the Senator from Georgia brought this joint resolution up today because I think the sooner it is enacted into law the better it will be for the crop situation in America.

I was detained in the Appropriations Committee on another matter, and as I came into the Chamber a few moments ago I heard a letter being read from my good friend O'Neal of the American Farm Bureau Federation. He is one of the finest men in the world. He and I have been devoted friends for many years. He and I were born in the same section of Alabama. In general, we have had much the same views with respect to the farmers of the country. I did not understand that Mr. O'Neal had the slightest objection to the first section of the joint resolution. Indeed, from the standpoint of Mr. O'Neal and my own standpoint, I think it is superior to the section in the measure passed by the other House. It will be remembered that the House section provided that \$13,500,000 could be expended by the Extension Services.

The section under discussion provides that not less than \$13,500,000 shall be available for the agricultural extension services, and not more than \$20,000,000 may be expended in that way. From the standpoint of expenditures by local authorities, such as the agricultural extension service of each State, it is, to my mind, a much better provision than the one originally contained in the House joint resolution. I think the greatest benefit which would probably result from this measure would be the benefit coming from the activities of the agricultural extension services.

From talking to Mr. O'Neal since the joint resolution was reported, I am quite sure that he is in full and hearty sympathy with the first half of it dealing with the extension services.

With regard to the expenditure of further funds, the amount has been increased to \$20,000,000. Western States, such as Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, California, and Idaho, are greatly interested in obtaining labor principally from Mexico. Our country has an agreement with Mexico by which that may be done. Section 2 of the joint resolution largely carries out that agreement. It is true that its administration has been put into the charge of Mr. Davis, who is the new head of the agricultural section dealing with this matter. That is entirely proper. I do not see how we could do otherwise. Under the joint resolution as passed by the House, the administration of the provision to which reference has been made was placed in the

land-grant colleges of the country. I doubt the wisdom of that. I think Mr. Davis ought to be put in charge of it.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has had charge of the joint resolution. I was chairman of the subcommittee which dealt with it, but was ill at the time and could not take charge. I desire to say that I think the measure is better than anything I could have prepared. I think the Senator from Georgia has done a very fine piece of work in both these matters. I am not so sure that he agreed with everything that the subcommittee put into the measure so far as the first section is concerned; but being a careful and prudent legislator, he gave and took, and therefore he agreed to the first section as it was written. So far as the extension services of the various States are concerned, the joint resolution could not possibly have been improved upon by anyone.

The second part of the joint resolution is considerably more difficult because we had to deal with the situation as it existed in foreign countries. A number of States such as Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, California, Idaho, and other western States—even the splendid State of the distinguished Senator from Michigan—depend on these outside agencies for the furnishing of labor. It is a very important matter to the Senator from Michigan, as well as to his State, because they have to depend on labor obtained from outside sources, particularly in the growing and harvesting of sugar beets. I believe the same condition applies to the State of New York, and perhaps in a lesser degree to other States. But the principal northern States to which this section applies are Michigan first, then New York, and then to other States in a lesser degree. I think the provision with respect to the second \$20,000,000 is certainly agreeable to those States. It certainly ought to be agreeable to them under any circumstances.

To deal with such a subject, manifestly, was very difficult. I do not think our subcommittee ever passed upon a measure that has been more carefully and more painstakingly prepared than this one was prepared by the subcommittee. It was almost unanimously agreed to by the full committee. With the exception of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]—I do not recall any other Senators—who reserved the right after examining the joint resolution to vote for it or against it, it received the unanimous approval of both the full committee and the subcommittee. I think the Senator from Massachusetts stated a few moments ago that he felt then, as he feels now, that he did not know whether it would work as it has been arranged.

I think the provision which was written into the bill through the efforts of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] under which old men who receive benefit payments from the Government are allowed to work on a farm and not lose such benefits, is an admirable provision at this time of our great stress, and I think we may depend upon those men to do excellent work on the

farm or, at least, most of them. It seems to me that is an excellent provision.

If Senators will look at the limitations provided on pages 10 and 11 and the "miscellaneous provisions" of the joint resolution I think he will realize that the subcommittee and the full committee undertook in every way they could to hedge it about in such a way as to bring the greatest benefit to the farmers of the country and, at the same time, do as little harm as possible. For that reason, I sincerely hope that the motion of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will not be agreed to, for I believe that if the joint resolution were sent to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry it could not be improved.

Mr. REVERCOMB and Mr. DAVIS addressed the Chair.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from West Virginia rose first, and I yield first to him.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator please look at line 25 on page 10.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The joint resolution appropriates \$40,000,000 and provides that—

(b) No part of the funds herein appropriated, or heretofore appropriated or made available to any department or agency of the Government for the recruiting, transportation, or placement of agricultural workers, shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership, with respect to any agricultural labor—

That is very clear, but this language follows—

except with respect to workers imported into the United States from a foreign country and then only to the extent required to comply with agreements with the government of such foreign country.

I ask the Senator does that mean that the moneys appropriated under this joint resolution may be used directly or indirectly to fix or regulate union membership and to enforce collective-bargaining with respect to persons imported from other countries to labor in the United States?

Mr. McKELLAR. Not exactly that. I wish to say to the Senator—and I am glad he has asked the question—that, while I was not present when that provision was placed in the joint resolution, I was present when it was subsequently discussed.

The reason for it was that under the agreement now existing between the United States and Mexico—I do not know whether there is an agreement with any other country or not; I have forgotten; perhaps there may be one with the Bahama Islands—but under the agreement with Mexico it is provided that there shall be a minimum wage paid those coming from Mexico. I am familiar with that. That is the reason for making the exception to which the Senator refers which reads:

except with respect to workers imported into the United States from a foreign country, and then only—

I call the attention of the Senator to these words:

and then only to the extent required to comply with agreements with the governments of such foreign country.

I have not the agreement before me, but there is such an agreement, and the Senator from Georgia, who is not for the moment in the Chamber, is familiar with it. The Senator from Arizona who has taken a very great interest in the matter, and whose State is greatly interested in this proposed legislation, is also familiar with it. That agreement provides that there shall be a minimum wage, and, perhaps shelter, provided to workers who are imported from Mexico. Of course we are obliged, in carrying out that agreement with a foreign country, to write in the measure such language as will effectuate it. That is the reason for it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should like to ask another question, if I may address it to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Why, then, if the agreement provides for shelter and for minimum hours or wages, has there been written into this measure that with respect to the workers brought in from foreign countries the money appropriated may be used to enforce collective bargaining and union membership?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee permits me at this point, let me say that there is nothing in the Mexican agreement that has anything to do with union membership or collective bargaining.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then, why is such a provision in the joint resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. This is a prohibition against a practice which grew up in the United States, as alleged by some persons, at least, and is designed to meet objections of that kind. The House put in the measure a provision which made it unworkable. If the Senator will read the words as they appear prior to the word "except," in line 7, he will find that is the text of the House bill. If we said that none of the money appropriated by this measure could be used for any of the purposes mentioned, and the Mexican agreement provides for any one of those things, then none of this money could be used to bring workers from Mexico. One of the provisions in the agreement with Mexico is for a minimum wage of 30 cents an hour, and there is a provision that there shall be suitable housing. None of the other provisions are in the Mexican agreement. Therefore, the Senate committee simply provided that the prohibition as written by the other House should apply except to the extent that the Mexican agreement might modify it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is there any other agreement except the Mexican agreement?

Mr. HAYDEN. There is one relating to the importation of some 5,000 persons from the Bahama Islands. Those are the only two I know of at the present time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Bahama agreement include any other provisions

than those for minimum pay and for housing?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is all as I understand. The Bahama agreement is very similar to the Mexican agreement.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am practically through. I desire to add to what I have already said that I am opposed to the joint resolution being referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or to any other committee, because the House committee dealt with it as an appropriation bill, and the House dealt with it as an appropriation bill, and, necessarily, it went to the Appropriations Committee and, necessarily, it should not go to any other committee. All these matters no doubt will be very accurately worked out in conference, and in conference we may have to have a give and take process, such as we all know frequently happens.

Time is of the essence in the situation. Today is the 8th of April. In the section of the country from which I come, when I was a boy we were planting crops at this time of the year. We are considering a condition affecting the southern tier of States, and we should act at the very earliest possible moment.

I had very little to do with working out the joint resolution. I returned to the Senate, after being ill, the last day or two of its consideration, but the other members of the committee have worked out what I think is a most admirable measure, which I believe will result in the production of additional crops to a greater degree than under any other measure which could be suggested.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Pennsylvania asked me to yield, and I yield to him first.

Mr. DAVIS. As I understand, there are now two countries which have agreements with the United States regarding labor.

Mr. McKELLAR. I so understand.

Mr. DAVIS. Under the measure now pending could the Secretary of State enter into agreements with other countries, and bring in workers from countries other than the two which have been named?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, some mention has been made in the press of the fact that there might be some importations of labor from the island of Jamaica. That is the only other country mentioned, so far as I know. That, I believe, is due to the fact that because of the shortage of shipping, the agricultural crops from Jamaica could not be exported, and it was thought some of the workers might be brought to this country to help on a basis similar to that under which laborers are being brought from Mexico and the Bahamas.

Mr. DAVIS. Have the agreements already entered into been made a part of the RECORD, are they set forth in the hearings?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have not been on the floor during every min-

ute of the discussion, and it may be that the question I wish to ask has already been answered, but it runs in my mind that some weeks ago, possibly some months ago, certainly rather recently, at any rate, the Secretary of Agriculture spent some time in Mexico, with assistants, working out a plan whereby the labor question between the United States and Mexico would be very well handled. I wondered whether it was necessary to have further legislation of this kind at the moment.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am familiar with the matter, and if the Senator from Tennessee will yield to me, I shall be glad to answer the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. No legislation is contemplated which would make any provision with respect to the Mexican agreement, except to allow it to operate. In the form in which the pending joint resolution passed the House, it required a renegotiation of the agreement with Mexico within 30 days. If there were no new agreement with Mexico within 30 days, we would not obtain any labor from that country at all.

The testimony before the committee was that while the agreement with Mexico is not entirely satisfactory, and perhaps we might get a better one sometime, it is the only one we now have. It provides a limitation that not more than 50,000 Mexicans may enter the United States under the agreement, and up to now less than 10,000 have come in. As a matter of fact, we have spent much time, in the committee and in the Senate, discussing the very smallest degree of help the farmers will get. The great bulk of the money carried in the second part of the joint resolution is not to be spent to bring in foreigners, it is to be expended in taking labor from one part of the United States to another. Customarily there has been a migration, up to half a million people, from one part of the country to another. Those people cannot travel now because they cannot get gasoline and tires; so it is necessary for the Federal Government to provide them with some form of transportation, and the money proposed to be appropriated will provide for it.

The major portion of the money carried in the second part of the measure will be expended, not to transport foreigners but to move people from one State to another, as the crops require.

Mr. BUTLER. The other question I have in mind is prompted by what happened this morning in the Committee on Banking and Currency when Chairman McNutt, of the War Manpower Commission, testified to the great unemployment which exists in the State of New York, which was mentioned by the Senator a moment ago. I wanted to be sure that we were going first to take care of the unemployment there is within our own country before we become too much concerned about bringing people in from foreign countries.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator's remark is entirely accurate, and I agree with him. What he seeks is provided for in the joint resolution. There is an ad-

ditional provision allowing those who are receiving small payments from the Government to work without losing such payments.

I hope the pending motion will be voted down, and that the very excellent joint resolution now pending will be passed and allowed to go to conference this afternoon.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Tennessee knows my great admiration and respect for him and the pleasure it always gives me to follow him. There is one thing which bothers me about the pending joint resolution. Section 2 creates an organization to recruit and to do several other things within the States. That refers to the Agricultural Extension Service. It is made mandatory; that organization must be used.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure the Senator agrees with that section of the bill.

Mr. BYRD. I entirely agree with it.

Mr. McKELLAR. That applies to one-half of it.

Mr. BYRD. The part with which I do not agree is section 1, because it sets up a duplicate organization to do the same work.

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. BYRD. To recruit, and place, and do all the other things which section 2 provides for, so far as labor sent out of a State is concerned.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; that provides that this department shall have jurisdiction to do that work, but no provision is made for setting up any new bureau.

Mr. BYRD. I did not say a new bureau; I said another organization. One is made mandatory for the labor within the State. That is fixed, is it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is fixed.

Mr. BYRD. Section 3 provides for another organization, which would not use the organization set up by section 2. It may be the United States Employment Service, it may be the Farm Security Administration, it may be any other agency of the Government.

Mr. HAYDEN. But the Senator will agree that a State extension service cannot go into another State, or across the United States to recruit labor, and set up an organization to do it.

Mr. BYRD. The recruiting is done within the State.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let us understand the picture in some proportion. From 85 to 90 percent of the labor that is to be moved in order to handle crops is going to move inside the State. Everyone knows that. So 10 percent of the labor has to be found somewhere else. That which is to be inside the State is to be in the hands of the State extension service, and that is where the great benefit will come from the joint resolution. As to the 10 percent to be obtained from outside the State, it is not possible to send a county agent or a State extension director into another State.

Mr. BYRD. There is a county agent in every county in the United States. It is not necessary to send a county agent from one State to another. There is an

administrator who is in charge of all county agents. There are three thousand-odd counties, and every one has a county agent. It is not necessary to send an agent from Virginia to Tennessee. We can send requisitions to the Administrator here for the labor, and he can then distribute it to the respective States. That does not mean that a county administrator or agent would come to my State of Virginia, because there is a central agency in Washington to handle the matter. I cannot understand why there is a desire to create two organizations to do the same work.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is not proposed to create two organizations to do the same work. One is to recruit labor in the State.

Mr. BYRD. It is recruiting labor.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; but it is not the same labor.

Mr. BYRD. There is only a certain amount of labor to recruit. If there are two agencies recruiting the labor, we add to the confusion, and they compete with each other.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator has a total misconception of how the measure would operate. We appropriate money for these purposes—one function to be inside the State and one outside the State. The only way to handle anything outside a State is to perform it as a Federal function. That is what is provided for.

Mr. BYRD. It is all performed as a Federal function because the Food Administrator has the right to direct and to veto everything a county agent may do. It is not a local function, anyway.

Mr. HAYDEN. How would the Senator correct it? If he objects, how would he correct it?

Mr. BYRD. I would use the Agricultural Extension Service to do the recruiting, for example.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is, the Senator would send the county agents from Arizona to Virginia to recruit laborers and take them to a different place?

Mr. BYRD. No. If the Senator from Arizona will permit, I should like to make clear what I mean. Let us say there are 100 unemployed persons in my county of Clarke in Virginia. Those persons are available for labor. Why should two agencies be able to recruit that labor?

Mr. HAYDEN. Under the pending measure two agencies would not recruit that labor.

Mr. BYRD. The bill provides for it. It provides—

The purposes for which such funds may be expended by such extension services shall include, among other things, the recruiting, placement . . . and training of such workers; . . . transportation, supervision—

And a long list of things they may do. The same authority and the same activity is exactly duplicated under section 3 for some other agency of the Government. If that is not a duplication I simply cannot read the English language.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is not a duplication, because it applies to a different set of persons.

Mr. BYRD. I understand that, but the recruiting of labor is one activity, is it not, whether the labor is used in the State or outside the State?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; but the recruiting must be done by a Federal agent outside the State to move the labor inside the State.

Mr. BYRD. Even a farm agent cannot prevent a laborer being taken from his county if an appeal is taken to the Food Administrator and the Food Administrator sustains the appeal.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator objects to the Food Administrator doing it, who does he want to do it?

Mr. BYRD. I do not object to the Food Administrator doing it. I object to two agencies doing it. What I object to is a duplication of effort. I wish to do something in a simple economical way.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator knows I agree with him very heartily on the subject of duplication of effort. He and I have been working for about a year and a half to try to accomplish something along the line of prevention of duplication of effort.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Tennessee has rendered a most valuable service in that respect.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have looked into this matter most carefully, and in view of the fact that the Federal Government appropriates all the money I am utterly unable to see why it is not entirely proper to place a Federal bureau in charge of the work. We have been assured that no additional help will be requested; that no additional agencies will be set up, but that the work will be done within the bureau, under the direction of the head of the bureau, who is, I think, a satisfactory person to have charge of it. He is so much better than some who might be chosen that I am almost willing to leave it to him. I am quite sure that this money will be spent to the very best advantage to the farmers who are affected by the measure, and that it will be the best possible way to get an increase of food for the coming year.

Mr. BYRD. I am not objecting to the Senator's statement insofar as the need of some organization is concerned, but what I am objecting to is that this provision creates two organizations; it creates one within the State to be conducted by the Agricultural Extension Service which is under the control of the National Administrator. This is all a national function. Every dollar of the money to be used is being appropriated by the Federal Government. It sets up another organization which is not described in the bill. It may be the Farm Credit Administration. There is no definite guaranty made to Members of the Senate that the Farm Credit Administration, an organization to which there is great objection in Congress, will not be the agency which will undertake the activities under section 3, and which will thereby duplicate and compete with the efforts of the Agricultural Extension Service in the recruitment of labor and

the other activities provided for in the measure.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I suppose there is no other State which more imperatively needs the assistance provided by some such measure as this than the State of California. I wish to make a statement concerning what I understand to be the actual working of the joint resolution. We in California first must be able to move around our own labor within the State in order to meet the changing needs of our farmers. In addition, after Mexican workers are brought into the State we will then have to have some agency within the State which will be able to move such Mexican workers around. Insofar as the handling of the transient farm workers in California, who are there now, or after they are brought in, the farm extension service will be admirably adapted to do that, and will be empowered by this joint resolution to do it. But I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Virginia, whose courage and intellect I so very much admire, that I do not see how any farm extension agency in the State of California would have the power or the personnel or the authority to go down into Mexico and recruit Mexican workers. I feel that we must have some superior Federal agency which can recruit workers from Mexico or some other foreign country and transport them into the State.

Mr. BYRD. Let me ask the Senator a question. The Agricultural Extension Service is a large organization. The personnel of that organization could be used to go to Mexico or to go to any other country under the direction of the Food Administrator. All this, it will be remembered, is under the direction of the Food Administrator. Section 2 provides for administration by the Agricultural Extension Service, which is under the Food Administrator, and so does section 3. If labor from Mexico is needed, there is now existing in the Agricultural Extension Service a personnel which could be sent to Mexico to recruit the labor.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me invite the attention of the Senator from Virginia to this situation: Probably there are 5 or 10 or 15 States, principally in the West and the Southwest, which, we hope, will have workers from Mexico assisting farmers in those States. Manifestly, farm extension workers in Arizona could not go to Mexico and recruit laborers for Arizona. California farm extension workers could not go to Mexico and recruit laborers for California. The same thing is true with respect to farm extension workers in Montana, Wyoming, and other States. So it seems to me that some bureau or agency must be set up by the Federal Government which would have the personnel necessary to go into Mexico to recruit workers.

Mr. BYRD. The Agricultural Extension Service, as the Senator from California knows, is not confined to farm agents. If it were necessary to add to that organization, it would not be a diffi-

cult thing to do. Personnel could be added to that organization if additional personnel were needed. What I object to is that two organizations are set up under this bill to do practically the same work, insofar as recruiting labor is concerned. There is no guaranty whatever to anyone that the Farm Security Administration, to which an overwhelming majority of the Senate and of the House are bitterly opposed, will not be designated as the agency under section 3 to perform this work.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, as I recall the testimony of Mr. Chester Davis, who appeared before the committee only a few days after he was appointed Food Administrator, he testified that he was not able at that time to go into the detail of this matter, but he would like to speak about the over-all picture.

I believe this measure is quite largely the result of the understanding of the committee of the problems presented by Mr. Davis, plus the House bill which came to the Senate and which was undoubtedly directed toward eliminating the Farm Security Administration from handling this particular feature of the farm-labor problem. So determined was the House to eliminate the Farm Security Administration from handling the matter that a number of Representatives came and testified before our committee. One of them specifically pointed out that he did not want to see men leave the Farm Security Administration, as that organization had been eliminated in the House joint resolution, put on different hats and come in and do the same work under some other organization. When Mr. Davis came before our committee, I pointed out to him that that was the definite view of the House, as I understood it, and Mr. Davis said he had the same understanding. I told him that was also my view, and, so far as I could judge the temper of several members of the committee, that it was also their view. But Mr. Davis pointed out to us that we are late at this hour in getting at this problem of recruiting the farm labor.

Mr. President, the sad part of the situation is, as I see it now, that in laying the strategy of our war effort, food has not been properly represented at the council table. It has been testified before our committee that to meet the requirements of this Nation and its commitments at the present time, and to provide for emergencies which are foreseeable, we will be required to produce at least 8 percent more food than we did last year. But the best information we can get from the county agents throughout the Nation is that we will fall short anywhere from 1 percent to 30 percent of the production we had last year. If we fall short even 15 percent of last year's production, and if we fail to obtain the 8-percent increase which we are told we must have, as the whole strategy of America's participation in the war is based upon at least a 25-percent shortage in food production in the coming year, anything which now retards that production is dangerous.

That was why Mr. Davis said to the committee that, although he did not

want to create another bureau, he felt he should have a rather free hand in moving as rapidly as he could move to meet this problem. Since he is to be the one to direct the effort to meet it, I am basing my judgment upon his testimony, because he said he felt that the extension services were the proper ones to ascertain the need within the counties, to accept the labor which came to the counties, and to place it within the counties, but that he might have to use any number of other agencies, and he did not wish to exclude entirely even Farm Security, which I would have been willing to exclude permanently but for the lateness of this hour. Food is going to be the bottleneck of this war, and it will be the breaking point of the war unless we do everything we can to produce it now.

For that reason I believe we should give Mr. Davis the opportunity to move forward, using his knowledge that it is the will of Congress—and certainly he knows from the discussion had today in the Senate, from the House bill, and from our discussion with him in the committee that it is the will of Congress—that he do not put the Farm Security back in command in any real degree of this problem.

Again I say that because food has not been properly represented at the council table in the consideration of the over-all problem of America's participation in this global war, we should give Mr. Davis a chance at this late hour to move as quickly as he can move. I think the whole situation was changed when Mr. Davis came in. He came in late, but I think we should afford him the opportunity to proceed, and then hold him responsible, he having been told what the will of Congress is in the matter.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, yesterday nearly every State was represented by its director of the Selective Service System at a meeting held in the caucus room of the Senate Office Building. Other officers of the Selective Service System were present; so the gathering included approximately 75 persons. The unanimous evidence relating to the particular subject now under discussion was that there has been a marked migration of men between the ages of 18 and 38 from nonessential occupations to the farms, whether they were in one or another classification of deferment, all of them being within the class of those who, under the existing orders of the Selective Service System and under the possible law, might be called into service.

That proves two things. First, it proves that the need is being to some extent relieved; secondly, it proves the all-significant fact that it was the compulsion of liability which caused this movement of marked proportions during the last 30 days, and especially marked during the last 10 days. The opportunity to learn these facts came to us yesterday by chance.

Mr. President, in order for men between the ages of 18 and 38 to come under the protecting shield of occupational deferment, there is no need for those of them who are engaged in occupations essential to the war effort to go

back to the farms. They can remain where they are, and can serve their country in skilled activities, even though they are skilled farmers, too; and at the same time they can draw much higher wages than those they could receive on the farms, and can enjoy a much more glamorous life.

So there is no exodus from essential occupations back to the farms. Why is that so? Because there is no compulsion or liability which causes them to go back to the farms.

Mr. President, I beg of you not to consider me as being cynical about this matter. I am trying to present some cold facts for the consideration of the Senate at this moment.

Aside from considering the experience as to the group of men between the ages of 18 and 38 as to whom exists the liability for service at the front, where there is danger of being shot, let us consider what has been the experience with the other groups, as shown by the evidence which, since October 1942, has been in process of being taken. We can talk all we please about "recruiting," but that is the wrong word. We cannot recruit those men. The proper word is "shifting."

Even under the work-or-fight order under which a certain degree of sanction or coercion exists, to be applied indirectly, how does the measure attempt to shift work? Mr. President, the first area which was organized was the Baltimore area. There is where the longest experience has been had. The evidence shows the following with respect to the shifting; and if this is not striking evidence of the fact that men do not move by being requested to move, then I do not know what evidence is:

The record of the attempts of the United States Employment Service to get these men—

That is, men who were in nonessential occupations—

to take vital jobs was poor. The United States Employment Service took 96,938 talent questionnaires from the Army in July, but its staff was too small to analyze that number. It analyzed about 20,000 cases. Of these, 2,734 of the best qualified were called in for interview and selection. The best 1,123 were then offered the 1,123 jobs then available. Acceptance was voluntary and depended on the amount of interest shown both by employer and by candidate. If the man did not like the looks of the job, that ended it. Only 49 of the 1,123 men, about 1 in 25, were sufficiently interested to go to see the employer. Of these 49, 4 failed to report, and 4 more refused the employer's offer. This left only 41, some of whom dropped out later. There were only 26 verified placements.

The country needed 1,123 workers in vital war jobs from Baltimore just then and could get only 26, or about 2 percent of the qualified 1,123.

Mr. President, that survey was made by Market Analysis, Inc. The statistical data and other detailed information found in the pamphlet have been obtained from the following sources:

The War Manpower Commission and the various agencies included in the Baltimore office of the Commission.

The United States Employment Service.

The War Production Board.

The Commissioner of Labor Statistics.
The local State and city departments of education and welfare.

The Urban League.

The Fair Rent Commission of Baltimore.

It was edited by Sanford Griffith, who is probably well known to many of us.

Mr. President, I make this point because it seems to me that great as is the need of agriculture, and imminent as it is, the problem cannot be solved by merely appropriating money and declaring that it may be used for the purpose of recruiting and moving labor, paying for its transportation, and providing this and that, to shift men from New York City to some other place.

The effort to shift men, without any statutory liability on their part to go, was an abominable failure in the last war. Armed guards had to be put on the trains to keep from leaving men who had originally agreed to go, and who, while on their journey, became determined to get off the train at intermediate stations because they were sick of the idea of being transported so far. Without general liability to work, and without any way to mobilize the workers, I believe it would be utterly futile to appropriate great sums of money with the objective of inducing them to go.

Mr. President, let me make one further comment. I am not making a "plug" for Senate bill 666. What I have to say has to do with reference to the pending joint resolution. An attempt has been made in the latter part of the debate to shift the emphasis from the importation of foreign labor to the other element of the joint resolution, namely, the transfer of domestic labor. After only a brief study of the joint resolution and only this opportunity of hearing my colleagues talk about it, yet having listened with great care and study, it seems to me that the one element which calls for speed and requires immediate action is the element of immigration. If it be true, Mr. President, that the need for labor is in sowing the crops, then we probably cannot wait until we shall have handled the manpower question in a general way. It is probably true that we would have to import labor for that purpose at this time. Let me ask Senators who have been advocating this measure whether men are really needed to plant the crops, or whether the need is for confidence on the part of the farmer that when his crop grows he will have the labor to harvest it. Is not that the only question? If it is, there is no need to enact such a futile law as this would be, for, by that time, we can provide domestic labor for the job of harvesting.

The evidence already taken shows that we have the labor in this country. The difficulty is that it is in pools here and there. There are critical areas of shortage of manpower in various places, and there are other areas where there is a surplus, where men are idle. Under existing law, even with the power of an order of the Chief Executive to work or fight, we cannot mobilize those men, because they will not go. They will not be moved. They do not recognize any liability resting on them to volunteer to

go; and until the Congress declares a liability, which is supposed to be equal upon all mobile persons in this country, and makes all citizens equally liable to contribute to the war effort, this condition will continue and we shall have bill after bill presented to the Congress to try to solve it piecemeal, a little bit here and a little bit there, without any satisfactory result.

Mr. President, I hope that the joint resolution may be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to ascertain the fundamental facts. Is there need for men to plant the crops, or is this a problem of having men ready to harvest the crops, or of enacting legislation which will give the farmer confidence that if he increases the amount of his plantings which will be harvested in the fall he will then have the labor to harvest the crops? If the Committee on Agriculture finds that to be the condition, then let us not pass this kind of piecemeal legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if there is any prospect of obtaining a vote on the joint resolution immediately, I hope we may proceed to vote upon it. Before the Senate adjourns I desire very briefly to make some observations concerning the remarks made earlier in the day by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], but I do not wish to interfere with the consideration of the joint resolution if there is any prospect of obtaining a vote on it immediately. Why can we not vote on it now?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to refer the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The motion was rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I note the absence of the sponsor of the motion to refer the joint resolution to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. LODGE]. I am very sorry that action was taken on the motion before he could reach the Chamber.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNARY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before the Senator from Massachusetts left the Chamber he told me that he had an imperative engagement with General Marshall, and would be called away. He asked me to register him in favor of his motion. Beyond that, I have no instructions from him.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I was absent from the Chamber for a few minutes. I knew that the Senator from Massachusetts had an appointment, but I thought he had canceled it. I did not want to have action taken in the way in which it was taken if the Senator from Massachusetts could reach the Chamber in a short time. Because of the absence

of the Senator from Massachusetts, I was about to ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the motion was rejected; but in view of the statement of the Senator from Michigan I have nothing further to say.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, has the joint resolution been read the third time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution has been read the third time.

Mr. McNARY. Earlier in the day the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] advised me that he desired to move to strike out section 4. I notice that he is absent from the Chamber. In order to protect his rights, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, did the Senator from Oregon refer to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]?

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Wyoming told me that he was compelled to go to the War Department to keep an appointment there. He said that he hoped to be able to return before the joint resolution was finally acted upon, but that if he did not, he necessarily could not offer his amendment, being at the War Department.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, again the matter has been explained away.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon insist on his point of no quorum?

Mr. McNARY. In view of the statement of the Senator from Georgia I do not insist on it. I merely wish to protect the rights of absent Senators.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, before the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] left the Chamber he stated to me that he desired to offer an amendment, and that if he did not return in time, he wished me to offer it in his behalf.

On behalf of the Senator from Wyoming I move to amend the joint resolution by striking out all of section 4, beginning with line 10, on page 10, and extending through line 16 on page 11.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The joint resolution having been read the third time, is it not too late to offer an amendment?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky is correct. The amendment could be offered only by unanimous consent.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think the rule should be observed. I object to the consideration of amendments after the third reading of the joint resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) was passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, ask for a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 635.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 635) to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no objection to taking up Senate bill 635. Earlier in the day I spoke with the eminent Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and I believe it was agreed that if we reached this period in the afternoon the request might be made, but the bill would then go over until the first of next week. I do not desire to object to the consideration of the bill today. I believe also that the distinguished leader of the majority [Mr. BARKLEY] would like to have the bill go over until Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, it had been my hope to dispose of the bill today and then adjourn until Monday; but if we cannot dispose of it today, if it is agreeable to the Senator in charge of the bill, it will be entirely agreeable to me to make it the unfinished business and let it go over until Monday.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, it is perfectly agreeable to me to have the bill go over until Monday, except that I am informed that the chairman of the Civil Service Committee [Mr. Downey] will be out of the city on an important com-

mittee assignment on Monday. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who has had a great deal to do with the formation of the bill, will likewise be out of the city on Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suppose that under the circumstances the Senate will have to accommodate itself to the convenience of absent Senators instead of transacting business here where we were sent to transact it. I suppose we should recess from time to time until all Senators return to Washington so that business can then be transacted by the Senate. I do not say that in any critical spirit with respect to the two Senators who have been mentioned; but during this session Senators have been absent on one mission or another all over the United States, if not all over the world. They are everywhere except in the Senate, where they were chosen to serve.

I hope that we can transact the business of the Senate without having to adjourn from day to day because Senators desire to be absent. It is immaterial to me whether the bill is taken up tomorrow. I am perfectly willing to move a recess and have a session of the Senate tomorrow if we can dispose of the bill. Otherwise, let it go over until Monday. If we are to adjourn from today until Monday next, we must have some business to transact on Monday. It is not convenient to meet on Tuesday, because it is planned to hold a ceremony dedicating the Jefferson Memorial in Potomac Park. For that reason we are not contemplating a meeting on Tuesday next, so I hope that Senators will be able to accommodate their individual situations to the necessities of the Senate.

There is a great deal of criticism throughout the country because of absenteeism in factories and war plants. The first thing we know criticism will be centered on the Senate; and it may not be inappropriate when it comes.

I notice that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is looking at me intently. The situation is becoming such that I cannot look at a Senator when I speak without being charged with implying something about him. The Senator from Michigan is almost as handsome as the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] who yesterday thought, because I looked at him, that I was implying something with regard to him. If Senators object to my looking at them when I speak, I will shut my eyes, although it would be to my great disadvantage if I were not permitted to look into the handsome and beaming countenances of my friends in the Chamber. [Laughter.]

I hope that we can take the bill up on Monday if not tomorrow. Would tomorrow be convenient?

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. Tomorrow would be convenient.

Mr. President, it was rather understood that we would adjourn from today until Monday. With that thought in mind, I did not want to split consideration of the bill by jumping from today until Monday, but I am willing to start

now and meet tomorrow to conclude consideration of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the circumstances I think that would be the best thing to do. There was a general understanding that if we could finish these two measures today we would adjourn until Monday; but the joint resolution which we just passed took much more time than I expected it to take.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection to adjourning until Monday. That is perfectly satisfactory. I merely wish to avoid a hiatus.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator. I do not want a hiatus any more than he does. We might be able to finish with the bill today. It is now only 4 o'clock.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I doubt whether it will take very long. I should like to proceed for a little while today. If we can finish very well. If we cannot, in view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] had so much to do with forming the bill, I should like to have it disposed of while he is present. If we could proceed for a while today we might possibly dispose of it without another session.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is entirely agreeable to me. I said a moment ago that I was compelled to make a few remarks because earlier in the day the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] criticized an order issued by the War Department, which I think should be explained so that there can be no misunderstanding about it. The Senator from Michigan is as anxious to know the facts as I am to present them.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 1860, and when the bill shall have been taken up, I shall move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and substitute in lieu thereof the language of Senate bill 635 as reported to the Senate by the Committee on Civil Service.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New York.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1860) to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and insert the language of Senate bill S. 635, as reported to the Senate by the Committee on Civil Service.

The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, is as follows:

That this act shall apply to all civilian officers and employees (including officers and employees whose wages are fixed on a monthly or yearly basis and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates by wage boards or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose, except those in or under the Government Printing Office or the Tennessee Valley Authority) in or under the United States Government, including Government-owned or controlled corporations, and to those employees of the District of Columbia municipal government who occupy positions subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that this act shall

not apply to (a) elected officials; (b) judges; (c) heads of departments, independent establishments, and agencies; (d) officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; (e) employees whose wages are fixed on a daily or hourly basis and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates by wage boards or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose; (f) employees outside the continental limits of the United States, including Alaska, who are paid in accordance with local prevailing native wage rates for the area in which employed; (g) officers and employees of the Inland Waterways Corporation; and (h) individuals to whom the provisions of section 1 (a) of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes", approved March 24, 1943 (Public Law —, 78th Cong.), are applicable.

Sec. 2. Except as provided in section 3, officers and employees to whom this act applies shall be paid overtime compensation computed on the same basis as the overtime compensation which was authorized to be paid under Public Law No. 821, Seventy-seventh Congress: *Provided*, That such overtime compensation shall be paid only on the portion of an officer's or employee's basic rate of compensation not in excess of \$2,900 per annum: *And provided further*, That such overtime compensation shall be paid on such portion of an officer's or employee's basic rate of compensation notwithstanding the fact that such payment will cause his aggregate compensation to exceed a rate of \$5,000 per annum: *And provided further*, That in lieu of overtime compensation for work in excess of 48 hours in any administrative workweek, the heads of departments, establishments, and agencies may in their discretion grant per annum employees compensatory time off from duty.

Sec. 3. (a) Except as provided in subsection (c), officers and employees to whom this act applies and whose hours of duty are intermittent or irregular, officers and employees in or under the legislative and judicial branches (except those in the Library of Congress, or the Botanic Garden, and per annum employees in or under the office of the Architect of the Capitol who are regularly required to work not less than 48 hours per week) to whom this act applies, and, subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commission, officers and employees whose hours of work are governed by those of private establishments which they serve and for whom on this account overtime work schedules are not feasible, shall be paid, in lieu of the overtime compensation authorized under section 2 of this act, additional compensation at a rate of \$300 per annum.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (c), any officer or employee to whom this act applies, and who is entitled to no additional compensation under subsection (a), shall be paid for any pay period, in lieu of overtime compensation under section 2, additional compensation at the rate of \$300 per annum, unless his overtime compensation under section 2 for such pay period is at least equal to such additional compensation.

(c) Any officer or employee to whom this act applies and whose hours of duty are less than full time shall be paid, in lieu of overtime compensation or additional compensation under the foregoing provisions of this act, additional compensation at a rate of 12½ cents per hour for the hours which such officer or employee is required to work: *Provided*, That officers and employees to whom this act applies and whose compensation is based upon other than a time period basis shall be paid, in lieu of overtime compensation or additional compensation under the foregoing provisions of this act, additional compensation amounting to 10 percent of so much of their earned basic compensation for any pay period as is not in excess of a rate

of \$3,000 per annum: *And provided further*, That employees of the House and Senate restaurants shall be paid, in lieu of overtime compensation or additional compensation under the foregoing provisions of this act, additional compensation amounting to 20 percent of so much of their earned basic compensation as is not in excess of a rate of \$2,900 per annum.

Sec. 4. The provisions of section 3 of this act shall apply to the official reporters of proceedings and debates of the Senate and their employees; and the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, shall be applicable to any such official reporter or any such employee upon application therefor duly made to the Civil Service Commission.

Sec. 5. The act approved February 10, 1942 (Public Law No. 450, 77th Cong.), and section 4 of the act approved May 2, 1941 (Public Law No. 46, 77th Cong.), as amended, are hereby repealed.

Sec. 6. The provisions of the Saturday half-holiday law of March 3, 1931 (46 Stat. 1482; U. S. C., title 5, sec. 26 (a)), are hereby suspended for the period during which this act is in effect.

Sec. 7. The provisions of this act shall not operate to prevent payment for overtime services in accordance with any of the following statutes: Act of February 13, 1911, as amended (U. S. C., title 19, secs. 261 and 267); act of July 24, 1919 (41 Stat. 241; U. S. C., title 7, sec. 394); act of June 17, 1930, as amended (U. S. C., title 19, secs. 1450, 1451, and 1452); act of March 2, 1931 (46 Stat. 1467; U. S. C., title 8, secs. 109a and 109b); act of May 27, 1936, as amended (52 Stat. 345; U. S. C., title 46, sec. 382b); act of March 23, 1941 (Public Law No. 20, 77th Cong.): *Provided*, That the overtime services covered by such payment shall not also form a basis for overtime compensation under this act.

Sec. 8. Whenever the Civil Service Commission shall find that within the same Government organization and at the same location gross inequities exist, to such extent as to interfere with the prosecution of the war, between basic per annum rates of pay fixed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for storemen, stockmen, or inspectors in or under the Navy Department, or storekeepers, stockkeepers, inspectors, truck drivers, or elevator operators in or under the War Department, and the compensation of employees whose basic rates of pay are fixed by wage boards or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose, the Commission is hereby empowered, in order to correct or reduce such inequities, to establish as the minimum rate of pay for such class of positions any rate within the range of pay fixed by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for the grade to which such class of positions is allocated under such act.

Sec. 9. The Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of coordinating and supervising the administration of the provisions of the foregoing sections of this act insofar as such provisions affect employees in or under the executive branch of the Government.

Sec. 10. The heads of departments and agencies in the executive branch, whose employees are affected by the provisions of this act, shall present to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and to the Congress such information as the Director shall from time to time, but not less frequently than the first day of each quarter, require for the purpose of determining the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of their respective departments and agencies. The Director shall from time to time, but not less frequently than the thirtieth day after the beginning of each quarter, determine the number of employees so required, and

any personnel of any such department or agency in excess thereof shall be released at such times as the Director shall order. Such determination shall be reported to the Congress each quarter. Sections 2 and 3 of this act shall cease to be applicable to the employees of such department or agency unless the head thereof shall certify within 30 days from the effective date so prescribed by the Director that the number of employees of his agency does not exceed the number determined by the Director to be required for the proper and efficient exercise of its functions. Any determinations and directions made by the Director under the authority of Public Law 821, Seventy-seventh Congress, are hereby continued in effect until modified by him. The Civil Service Commission is authorized to transfer to other departments and agencies any employees released pursuant to this section whose services are needed in and can be effectively utilized by such other departments or agencies, and the services of these employees are to be utilized by the departments and agencies before additional employees are recruited.

Sec. 11. Amounts received as overtime compensation or additional compensation under this act shall not be considered in determining the amount of a person's annual income or annual rate of compensation for the purposes of paragraph II (a) of part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, or section 212 of title II of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes", approved June 30, 1932, as amended.

Sec. 12. This act shall not apply to civilian employees of the Transportation Corps of the Army of the United States on vessels operated by the United States or to vessel employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and such employees may be compensated in accordance with the wage practices of the maritime industry.

Sec. 13. This act shall take effect on May 1, 1943, and shall terminate on June 30, 1945, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe; except that the termination date contained in this section shall not be applicable to so much of section 4 as relates to the applicability of the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, to the official reporters of proceedings and debates of the Senate and their employees.

Sec. 14. This act may be cited as the "War Overtime Pay Act of 1943."

Sec. 15. The provisions of sections 2 and 3 of this act shall not be applicable to any person who is a member of any local union (the members of which are employed in any governmental agency) which discriminates against, or denies membership to, any person because of race, color, or creed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. If it will not interrupt the Senator's explanation of the bill, I shall be grateful if in the early part of his explanation he will inform the Senate whether or not the bill has the approval of the Budget Bureau, and whether or not the administration has taken any position upon it, either pro or con.

Mr. MEAD. In answer to my distinguished colleague I will say that early in my consideration of the matter I consulted a representative of the Civil Service Commission, a representative of the

Bureau of the Budget, the personnel representative of the White House, a representative of the Classification Board, and a number of others. They not only agreed on a bill but agreed on one the cost of which would be considerably in excess of the cost of the pending bill. I will say that our committee in the consideration of the bill reduced the cost from the original estimate by approximately \$200,000,000.

RESTRICTION OF POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not like to ask the Senator from New York to interrupt his discussion, and that is why I am asking him to yield to me now because of the remarks made earlier today by the Senator from Michigan, which I think ought not to be passed over. If the Senator will permit me to proceed, I shall not take long.

Mr. MEAD. I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, earlier in the day the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] commented upon the iniquity, as he conceived it to be, of an order issued on the 25th day of February prohibiting political activity on the part of men on active duty in the armed forces of the United States. The Senator's remarks are brief, and, in order that there may be proper connection between them and what I have to say, I shall read them. They are as follows:

RESTRICTION OF POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF ARMY OFFICERS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I want to make it plain at once that I am shocked by the War Department order of recent date that "no member of the military forces on active duty will hereafter become a candidate for or seek or accept—

With the word "accept" underscored—election to any public office not held by him when he entered upon active duty." I can understand the necessity for discouraging ordinary political activities on the part of members of the armed forces. But this order nullifies the fundamental rights of American citizenship. It inhibits, furthermore, the rights of our whole people to turn to the Military Establishment for high leadership in civilian places of high authority if civilian judgment wants to turn in that direction. I deny the right of the War Department to militarize the processes of American democracy.

I deny the right of the War Department thus to control indirectly American elections. I think I can understand the purpose. But I, for one, repudiate it. If the American people ever desire to draft a "member of the military forces" for high American responsibility, it will take more than the petty dictum of the War Department to deny them this high privilege.

We are not yet totally at the mercy of our self-serving overlords. If a great American emerges, for example, as the next most eligible President of the United States, the War Department cannot stop him just because he happens to be a "member of the military forces on active duty"—and it will make a blunder, as ineffectual as it will be transparent, if it tries.

Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan in his prepared statement said that he was shocked at the order issued on the 25th of February last upon the subject of political activity among those in the

active military service. A similar order was issued before the 25th of February, and, as a matter of fact, in effect this order has been in force since 1925. I do not suppose that in 1925 anybody could contend that there was any design on the part of those who issued the order to keep some person from being elected or aspiring to the office of President of the United States; and yet, in face of the fact that, in effect, this order has been in force for nearly 2 decades, the effort is now being made to create the impression that it was designedly issued by the Secretary of War through the Chief of Staff in order to make it impossible for somebody to be elected or to be a candidate for or to accept the office of President of the United States.

Today the Secretary of War, who is not a Democrat, as everyone knows, and who would be the last man, in my judgment, to stoop to such a subterfuge as to issue a military order in order to keep anyone from aspiring to high political office in this country, answered this question at a press conference in response to an inquiry made of him by a member of the press. I shall read the statement of the Secretary of War:

In response to a question asked by the press concerning a revision of Army Regulations issued February 25, 1943, the Secretary of War at his press conference, April 8, 1943—

That is today—

made the following answer:

As far back as 1925, Army Regulations (AR 600-10, June 30, 1925) prohibited persons on active duty from taking active part in political management of political campaigns. As far back as 1937, Army Regulations (change 3 to AR 600-10, July 15, 1937) prohibited persons on active duty from participating in non-military activities or interests which would tend to interfere with or hamper in any degree the full and proper discharge of their military duties, or would normally give rise to suspicion that such participation would have that effect. The above prohibitions were continued in effect at all times after they had first been promulgated. They were republished in the revision of AR 600-10 of September 6, 1938, which was the last revision of AR 600-10 before the current one of June 2, 1942.

In September 1941 the country being still at peace, the War Department relaxed the above rule as to elective office to the extent of allowing members of the Reserve components, who had been called to extended active duty and who were on leave status from public offices held by them, to run for election, on the condition that their election to and occupancy of such office would not interfere with their military duties (AG 000.1 (7-23-41) MB-A-M, September 26, 1941).

After Pearl Harbor, the country being then at war, it became essential to assure that all military personnel on active duty would devote their entire time and energy exclusively to the discharge of their military obligations. By War Department Circular No. 243, dated July 24, 1942, it was provided that "no individual on active duty will hereafter seek election or reelection to public office, or take an active part in political management or political campaigns."

Cases arose, however, in which this absolute prohibition worked unnecessary hardships, where members of Reserve components who were on leave status from public offices held by them were threatened with loss of substantial pension and retirement and other benefits, theretofore earned by them, if they could not stand for reelection. In consequence, the rule was relaxed by War Department Circular No. 413, dated December 18,

1942, so as to allow, in proper cases, individuals on active duty to become candidates for and accept reelection to public office held by them when they entered upon active duty, on condition that neither their candidacy for such office nor their occupancy thereof would interfere with their military duties.

The change, dated February 25, 1943, to AR 600-10, did not alter or modify anything in the foregoing. It merely consolidated the various outstanding directives, which were scattered in different places, and put them into one place, in the appropriate Army Regulations.

The War Department considers that the existing policy is not only wise and necessary from the point of view of the effective functioning of the Military Establishment in time of war, but, also, that it is the only policy which is compatible with democratic principles and procedures. Nothing could more directly expose a political system to the improper intrusions of the military, than to allow men to exercise military and civil (and, more especially, legislative) office simultaneously. The existing War Department policy, which prohibits officeholders from exercising the functions of office while on active military duty, is essential for the maintenance of the traditional American separation between the military and the civilian branches of government.

I wish to call attention to the fact that on July 24, 1942, the following order was issued by the War Department:

III. Political activities of military personnel on active duty: 1. Letter from The Adjutant General (A. G. 000.1 (7-23-41) MB-A-M), September 26, 1941, subject, Political activities of military personnel on active duty, is rescinded.

2. Paragraph 4c, AR 600-10, is applicable to all persons in the active military service, and no individual on active duty will hereafter seek election or reelection to public office, or take an active part in political management or political campaigns. Individuals who, prior to July 24, 1942, have obtained permission of the War Department to seek election to public office, may continue their candidacy and complete any leave therefor already granted. No additional leave will be authorized for this purpose.

Following that, on December 18, 1942, an order was issued which, so far as it was comprehensive, was a codification of the orders which had been theretofore issued regarding political activities on the part of men in the active military service of the United States. Under the heading "Political activities of military personnel on active duty," in the order dated December 18, we find the following:

No individual on active duty will hereafter become a candidate for or seek or accept—

In view of the emphasis placed on the word "accept" in the remarks of the Senator from Michigan, I am emphasizing the fact that last December the exact language used in the order of February 25 was used:

b. No individual on active duty will hereafter become a candidate for or seek or accept reelection to public office held by him when he entered upon active duty, without prior approval of the War Department, and such approval will be granted only in cases of material hardship and if, in the opinion of the commanding officer, such individual's candidacy for reelection to and occupancy of such office will not interfere with his military duties; and no leave will be authorized for

any purpose of campaigning for such reelection or of promoting or furthering same.

c. No individual on active duty will hereafter take an active part in political management or political campaigns.

d. Individuals who, prior to July 24, 1942, have obtained permission of the War Department to seek election to public office, may continue their candidacy and complete any leave therefor already granted, but no additional leave will be authorized for this purpose.

Following that, on the 25th day of February, a new order, which the Secretary of War described as a codification of orders which were lying around loose in the Department and which appeared in various documents, was issued. It seems that it was not discovered, or certainly there was no furor made over it, until the last few days, when it seems to have been interpreted as a deliberate effort on the part of the War Department to keep someone from running for some office. This is paragraph No. 1 of the order, still a part of Army Regulation 600-610:

No person in the military service will use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result thereof.

There is some more to it, then another paragraph, and we come to paragraph No. 3, as follows:

3. No member of the military forces on active duty will hereafter become a candidate for or seek or accept reelection to public office held by him when he entered upon active duty, without prior approval of the War Department, and such approval will be granted only in cases of material hardship and if, in the opinion of the commanding officer, such individual's candidacy for reelection to and occupancy of such office will not interfere with his military duties; and no leave will be authorized for any purpose of campaigning for such reelection or of promoting or furthering same.

4. No member of the military forces on active duty, whether on a duty status or on leave of absence or furlough, will act in his official capacity as the holder of any public office, or perform any of the duties thereof.

5. A member of the military service on active duty may be honorably discharged therefrom for the convenience of the Government upon his request in a proper case, for the purpose of performing the duties of a public office as specified in section 5 (c) (1) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. Requests for such discharges will be submitted to the War Department through military channels.

Mr. President, I call attention to this because some effort seems to have been made to create the impression that this is a diabolical order, that it was made for the deliberate purpose of denying some American citizen the right to run for office, or to accept office if he should be chosen.

I take it for granted that no one will dispute the soundness of the proposition and the theory that a man cannot well hold a military office, be charged with military duty, and be on active military duty, during the existence of a war, and at the same time hold a civilian office, and attempt to perform the duties of the civilian office. In my judgment, there would be nothing more subversive of the sound theories of democracy than to allow men in the military service

to take advantage of their service in order that they might appeal for election to civilian office, and that is all this order affects.

There is nothing new about it. It has been in existence and effect for some time. The only change made was as to the word "accept," and that change was made last December and not in February of this year. While it shocked the Senator from Michigan in April 1943 to see that new word in the order of February 25, the order was made in the same language last December, without any similar shock on the part of the able, eloquent, and sincere friend of mine from the State of Michigan.

I think the Senator from Michigan did not know, or, if he did, he probably had forgotten, that in the order issued last fall the same language was used; and there is no material difference in the effect of prohibiting a man in military uniform or on active duty from being a candidate for public office and from accepting a public office.

As a matter of fact, paragraph 5 of the order issued in February permits a man to resign from the Army if he wants to become a candidate. I dare say that in any case in which a military officer, or a private in uniform, on active duty, desired to resign in order that he might run for reelection to some office which he held, or in order that he might accept an office to which he might be elected, without any effort on his part so far as political management or political activities are concerned, he would be allowed to resign from the Army, but certainly he could not hold his place in the Army and hold his civilian job at the same time and try to be on duty in both places.

Mr. President, I think it is regrettable that this effort has been made, not only on the part of the Senator from Michigan, who is only echoing statements which have been made outside the Senate Chamber, but I noticed that yesterday a statement was made by a distinguished Member of another body, in which he charged that this order was issued in order to deny to a famous American general the right to run for President, and in order to guarantee that the President of the United States should have a fourth term. Any such statement as that is the quintessence of stupidity and quadrupled assinnity. That designation of it is not altogether unwarranted in view of the source from which the statement emanated. It was not a Member of this body, I will say, who made the statement.

I dare say that the President of the United States never saw this order. It was issued in line with other orders which had been issued from 1925 until now. It was a recodification of these orders which had been issued from time to time. It was done by the Secretary of War through the Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States.

Mr. President, whatever anyone may say about the political machinations of the President of the United States—and the mere fact that I am looking at the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] does not imply that I think he entertains any such views, and again I re-

peat that I have to look at somebody, and I might as well look at the Senator from Michigan—regardless of anything that anyone may think about the political machinations of the President of the United States, I do not believe that any Senator on this floor, or anyone in America who knows Gen. George C. Marshall, or who knows the outstanding record of the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, would assert or even entertain the idea that they would connive, in secret or even in public, in order to issue an order for the petty, pusillanimous, and contemptuous purpose of trying to keep some particular person from running for any office within the gift of the American people.

That is all I wish to say about the subject. I desire to ask unanimous consent to have printed at the close of my remarks an article which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald this morning, written by Mr. John O'Donnell. I sometimes find myself in disagreement with Mr. O'Donnell, but he has written a very enlightening article about this situation, calling attention to the fact that back in 1920 Gen. Leonard Wood wanted to run for President of the United States. He was a candidate. He went to the Chief of Staff of the Army, who was at that time General March, and told him he wanted to run for President, and that he wanted to run for that office in his uniform, he wanted to run while he was still a major general, and General March said that he, of course, would not think of undertaking to deny General Wood the right to run for President of the United States, but that he thought General Wood ought to have a leave of absence from the Army. General March took the matter up with Newton D. Baker, who was then Secretary of War, who took it up with President Wilson, against whom General Wood was desirous of being a candidate, and they gave General Wood 4 months' leave of absence from the Army of the United States in order that he might run for President, although, as Mr. O'Donnell says in his article, General Wood made the mistake of going to Chicago and appearing at the convention in his uniform of a major general of the United States Army.

I ask that that article be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, functioning in his capacity as Commander in Chief of the armed forces in World War No. 2, has broken sharply from the political principle laid down by his Democratic predecessor, Woodrow Wilson, Commander in Chief in World War No. 1.

The same problem confronted both. What should be done about the military hero who seeks high elective office challenging for power the administration ruling the Nation from the White House?

As a footnote to American history, this reporter can place on the record what happened when Woodrow Wilson, sitting in the White House, was told by his Chief of Staff, Gen. Peyton C. March, that Maj. Gen. Leonard

Wood, then on active duty as a major general, purposed to become a candidate for the Republican nomination for the Presidency in 1920.

The Democratic President then faced the political problem that the future might pose to President Roosevelt, if and when the political supporters of Gen. Douglas MacArthur might decide to toss the name of the American commander in the southwest Pacific into the 1944 Presidential race. Tuesday the War Department revealed that an order had been issued which neatly stymied any MacArthur political ambitions—"No member of the military forces on active duty will hereafter become a candidate for, seek, or accept election to any public office not held by him when he entered on active duty."

Note significantly that this White House War Department decree applies only to the Army. It does not apply to the Navy, into which the Willkie-intimate, internationalist Gov. Harold E. Stassen, of Minnesota, enrolls himself within the next few days and from which his friends confidently expect he will emerge as a White House possibility in 1948—after Franklin Delano Roosevelt's fourth term.

This is what happened a generation ago when General Wood, then on active duty, decided that he would become an active candidate for the Republican Presidential nomination.

Wood was uncertain about the proper procedure, worried about any infraction of military etiquette, but determined that he would make his fight for the White House.

This is what happened; and for the first time it's being told.

General Wood went to World War No. 1's Chief of Staff—the post now held by Gen. George C. Marshall—and in the gloomy office of the antiquated State, War, and Navy Building put his cards on the table.

Said General Wood to Chief of Staff March: "I am a major general in the United States Army on active duty under your command.

"I have decided that I shall actively campaign for the nomination for the Presidency of the United States.

"What do you wish me to do so far as my Army command is concerned?"

To this Chief of Staff General March replied:

"This is a free country and a democracy, and you have the right, General, to make a campaign for the Presidency. But as Chief of Staff I cannot permit you to campaign in opposition to the Commander in Chief while you are on active duty as a major general in the Army."

Replied General Wood:

"I am planning to do what I have told you in my rank as an Army officer on active duty."

The two generals talked over this impasse. Suggested the Chief of Staff:

"I have decided that I shall give you a 4 months' leave for this political effort of yours. But before reaching a decision let us take it up with the Secretary of War and the President."

Two hours later, Woodrow Wilson's Secretary of War, Newton Baker, was sitting behind his desk listening to the suggestion of Chief of Staff March and the political intentions of his subordinate Wood—intentions which were frankly designed to strike at the heart of the Wilson administration and the Democratic Party.

Said Baker:

"General Wood has every right to seek the nomination for the Presidency. I approve of the suggestion of the Chief of Staff to give him a 4 months' leave to conduct his political campaign. General Wood still remains on the rolls of the Army, of course, and later can be recalled to active duty."

Then came a brief dramatic meeting with Woodrow Wilson. The World War No. 1

President approved the arrangement and 4 months' leave was granted to Wood to muster political strength in an effort to destroy the party of which Wilson was the head.

General Wood made a big mistake.

He appeared at the convention in uniform and with his ribbons.

And privately, down at the War Department yesterday, the guardhouse lawyers, even those with stars on their shoulders, will whisper that Franklin D. Roosevelt's order ruling out Army officers from political campaigns, is strictly illegal, unconstitutional, immaterial, irrelevant, incompetent, and not binding on any defendant Army officer who wants to run for mayor, Governor, House, Senate, or White House.

All of which is high-priced legal language.

But none of them feels like challenging the official order just for the fun of a legal fight.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hope that in the midst of the great crisis in which our country is engaged, no one will undertake to divide us and create suspicion on the part of the American people against the men who are charged with the duty of conducting this war, by alleging any such petty, picayunish, dishonorable purpose as that which is implied in the criticism that this order was issued in order to keep somebody in particular from running for any office within the gift of the American people.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am very glad the able Senator from Kentucky has presented the complete record. I should like substantially to confine myself to the record as the Senator has presented it. I rather think the able Senator from Kentucky would be among the first to acquit me of any purpose or intention or effort at any time to divide the American people upon any phase of the war effort, and I do not take personally to myself at all any of the remarks the Senator made in that aspect.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is wholly justified in that assertion. I would be the first to acquit the Senator from Michigan of any such motive or purpose. But it is true that outside this Chamber efforts have been made to create the impression that the order was issued for a particular purpose, and I do not want that impression to go uncorrected. I again acquit the Senator from Michigan of any such purpose.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his statement. I quite agree with the able Senator that it is very easy to stir up a synthetic prejudice out of some of these tender and difficult and delicate situations, for which there may be in fact no justification whatever. For example, there are those who have been willing to intimate that there is something sinister about the fact that somewhere in this Government within the last 10 days an order was issued canceling a Government program to provide for a Nation-wide recognition of Bataan Day tomorrow for inadequately explained reasons. I am just indicating how easy it is for a text to be used prejudicially. I am not using it.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I understand the Senator is not using it. He is just

throwing it in here, but he is not using it. I had not heard that any such thing had been done. That may be eloquent testimony to my ignorance, but I had not heard that any such order had been issued. Perhaps it has.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I acquit the Senator of responsibility for ignorance on that score. He is in the same fix in respect to that that I was in respect to these prior Army orders which he tells me originated this utterly indefensible War Department rule, from my point of view, 2 or 3 months ago.

Let us now see about this rule. The rule, as I understand the Senator from Kentucky, has only recently been amended to include a prohibition against the acceptance—I emphasize the word "acceptance"—of public office by men in the active armed service of the country. That is the sinister word to which I apply my total indictment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would the Senator believe it to be a wise military policy to permit any man in the active service of the United States military forces to accept an office and still continue in the military service?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No. I will make it very plain exactly what I am talking about. I agree completely that the military and the political services should be totally, absolutely, unequivocally, unreservedly, effectively separated, and any man who accepts a designation for public office automatically should cease at that moment to have any relationship whatever to the military service. I agree completely. The Senator cannot charge me with having the slightest interest in permitting any sort of political activity within military units. But, Mr. President, I repeat what I said this noon, without any dilution or apology whatever. The acceptance of high public office, independent of any personal pursuit of it, is a totally different matter. If the time comes when a great representative convention of this country, speaking for millions of our people, no matter whether it be a Democratic or a Republican convention, concludes to draft a great military leader for the supreme command, not only of our war efforts but of our civil activities, I deny that there is any justification whatsoever in a War Department order which would even assume to try to restrict him at that point.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I interpret this order there would be no interference with any such procedure. If any convention should nominate any great military hero, or even a private, for any office, he could accept, but he could not accept while on active duty. The order itself permits him to resign. He would be in the same situation Mr. Justice Hughes was in when he was nominated for President of the United States while a member of the Supreme Court. There was no law preventing it, but there was a code of political ethics which prevented him from taking an active part in his

own nomination. He resigned immediately, and then accepted the nomination, not while on active duty as a Justice of the Supreme Court. Any man on active duty in the United States Army could do the same thing. He would not be accepting while on active duty, provided he separated himself from active duty prior to his acceptance.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Well, Mr. President, between us the Senator from Kentucky and I will sooner or later have the record clear. I do not think it is clear at all that the right of resignation is automatic under these circumstances. On the contrary, I conceive it to be the fact that the right of resignation is a very narrowly guarded right.

Mr. President, I want to demonstrate just how completely absurd the rule is, referring now to the word "accept" without in any sense justifying any sort of actual political activity by a man in uniform. Mr. President, no one would say, technically speaking, that when the President of the United States becomes Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy he is a member of our military forces on active duty; but, Mr. President, if there is any person under the flag who is in fact a member of our military forces on active duty it is the Commander in Chief, and he would be the first one in this country to insist that he was. Will anyone say that there would be any justification for a rule which would say that the Commander in Chief should be prohibited by a War Department order from seeking a fourth term in the White House? Now, Mr. President, that is not an objective about which I am overly enthusiastic; but I assert that if there is to be any restraint or restriction upon that right with respect to the Commander in Chief, it is a restriction which can be applied only by the people of the United States themselves. And yet the spirit of this order certainly should apply to the President in his role of Commander in Chief if it is to apply to anybody in the military service.

I insist that the order of the War Department, insofar as it undertakes in any fashion to circumscribe or discourage the acceptance of civil designation by a military leader who at the moment separates himself from the military service, is an order circumscribing the elective function and privilege and prerogative of the American people themselves.

There is no reason why we should quarrel about why this particular order has been issued and reissued and issued again—I think it has been issued three times—in the last 90 days. They certainly seem very anxious to be sure the order is out. To whom it may apply I shall not even undertake to say. But that it should apply to anyone in the armed service of the country, in respect to his right to accept a high political designation after it has been voluntarily given to him, I deny that there is any fundamental Americanism in any such attitude; and that will continue to be my opinion. I conclude by saying that no such order, whatever its intent, will ever foreclose the American people from choosing a great general of the

Army as President of the United States, if such be their electoral desire.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1860) to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes.

Mr. MEAD obtained the floor.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may submit an amendment?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I offer the amendment which has been printed and lies on the table, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York as a substitute for the House bill will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, line 4, of the committee amendment, after the words "per annum", it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a colon and the following:

And provided further, That no officer or employee shall be paid additional compensation under this section amounting to more than 25 percent of his earned basic compensation.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, on the part of the committee, I should like to accept the amendment and take it to conference. I think the amendment is a very worthy one.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I desire to make a short statement in support of the amendment, in order that the conferees may have the benefit of my views upon the subject and my reasons for offering the amendment.

The amendment does not affect the purpose of the bill in increasing the compensation of those to whom the bill is applicable and to whom it is intended to be applicable. The purpose of the amendment is merely to take care of a situation involving certain employees who are receiving a very small compensation in the way of a token payment. Some of them get as little as \$5 a month; so if \$300 per annum were added to their salary, the addition would be entirely out of line.

Therefore, the amendment simply would restrict the provisions of the bill so that it would not be applicable to cases in which the compensation would be increased in excess of 25 percent of the basic salary.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I accept the amendment, and on behalf of the committee I shall be glad to take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, let me inquire whether there are any further amendments to be offered.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has an amendment which now lies on the table. He is ill, and has asked me to

offer the amendment in his behalf. Therefore, I offer the amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6 of the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out lines 21 to 25, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 2. Except as provided in section 3, officers and employees to whom this act applies shall be paid overtime compensation for work in excess of 40 hours in any administrative workweek at a rate of one and one-half times their basic rates of compensation: *Provided*, That in computing the overtime compensation of per annum officers and employees, the base pay for 1 day shall be considered to be one two-hundred-and-sixtieth of the respective per annum salaries, and the base pay for 1 hour shall be considered to be one-eighth of base pay so computed for 1 day: *Provided*.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the issue presented by this amendment was considered at great length by the Senate Civil Service Committee. As a matter of fact, that was the major issue considered by the members of the committee. It was voted upon, and a substantial majority of the committee was opposed to the major portion of the amendment which has just been read.

I am not speaking as chairman of the committee in favor of the 260-day formula. I believe the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] voted for it. However, there was a heavy majority against it, and, of course, the amendment cannot be accepted by the chairman of the committee or by the Senator from New York and taken to conference.

Mr. BYRD rose.

Mr. DOWNEY. Before the Senator from Virginia speaks, I should like to call his attention to the fact that in addition to the major portion of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Utah there is another part of his amendment which would do away with our amendment, which would allow the head of an agency to grant compensatory time in lieu of overtime. Speaking as chairman of the Civil Service Committee, and looking back upon it, I do not believe that we sufficiently considered that particular phase of our amendment, nor were we fully advised. I am now restricting my remarks merely to that portion of the amendment of the Senator from Utah striking out of our amendment the right of the head of an agency to grant compensatory time, in lieu of money, for time in excess of 48 hours.

I ask that the conference committee be allowed to take that portion of the amendment of the Senator from Utah to conference.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I should like to ask the Senator from California what the chief objection was to the 260-day formula.

Mr. DOWNEY. I prefer to let the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] answer that question.

Mr. BONE. I am rather curious to know what the chief objection was to that proposal.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, it would provide what might be called bona fide time and a half for overtime, and would cost approximately \$200,000,000 in addition to the cost of the pending bill. I assume that the total cost of the amendment was the principal objection to it.

Mr. BONE. I know that there has been a great desire to have that particular provision adopted. There has been much correspondence on the subject.

Mr. MEAD. That is the yardstick by which all other Government employees who are on a time-and-a-half basis are paid. It is the same yardstick as is used in private enterprise. However, the committee decided to use the 1/360 formula, which reduces the cost of the bill by \$200,000,000 below what might be termed the Budget estimate.

Mr. BONE. Because of that particular principle, and in view of the fact that that formula has been employed by private companies, I wondered why the committee abandoned it.

Mr. MEAD. We provide straight time for overtime.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The committee has never abandoned the one two-hundred-and-sixtieth formula for civil-service employees, because Congress has never adopted it. The overtime computation is based upon one three-hundred-and-sixtieth.

Mr. BONE. I understand.

Mr. BYRD. If we should adopt the one two-hundred-and-sixtieth formula, we would put the civil-service employees who are employed on an annual basis on a straight 40-hour week, with overtime at time and a half above 40 hours. That would cost \$219,310,000 in addition to the other very substantial increases which have been given to civil-service employees. I think it was the judgment of members of the committee who voted against the one two-hundred-and-sixtieth formula that the civil-service employees should not be considered on an hourly basis, as provided by the wage-and-hour law. Although the wage-and-hour law has been in operation for a number of years, there has been no effort whatever to put the civilian clerical employees who are under civil service on the 40-hour-week basis. The 40-hour basis applies to Government workers in navy yards and arsenals, and those doing mechanical work.

One of the reasons which actuated me in opposing it was the fact that the civil-service employees of the Government have 26 days' leave or vacation each year, which they can accumulate up to 90 days. I know of no private enterprise which gives its employees 26 days' vacation with pay, with the privilege of accumulating leave up to 90 days. Civil-service employees also have 15 days' sick leave a year, which, likewise, is cumulative up to a total of 90 days. They also receive automatic increases in pay upon the com-

pletion of 18 months' service, or 30 months, according to grade, and they are frequently classified at higher salaries. They obtain benefits from a very liberal retirement fund, on the basis of 75 percent of the cost being paid by the Government and 25 percent by the employee.

So the committee, after very careful consideration, and by a very substantial majority, decided that we should continue the present plan of overtime payment, which is based on the 1/360 formula, and not the 1/260 formula, the difference being, as I have stated, about \$219,000,000. Employees of the Government under civil service cannot be classified as hourly employees, as would be the case if they were put under the wage-and-hour law. As the Senator knows, the wage-and-hour law provides that supervisory employees, such as foremen and others, shall be paid monthly compensation and not hourly compensation.

This amendment would place all the officials of the Government, including the heads of bureaus, but excluding the heads of departments, on an hourly basis, with time and a half for overtime above 40 hours. The committee very carefully considered the amendment and rejected it by a substantial vote. In passing the bill a day or so ago the House likewise rejected the 1/260 formula, and adopted the 1/360 formula which is contained in this bill.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, as a member of the committee I should like to add a word of further explanation on that same point, and in opposition to the Thomas amendment.

In this bill we are dealing with an attempt to provide something to make up for the increased cost of living of civil-service employees during the war. In the last war every civil-service employee was given \$240. There were some minor details in addition. In substance, this bill would give \$300 to every civil-service employee, exclusive of overtime. Then it deals with overtime, and fixes a minimum of \$300, but says, "If you will work overtime you can earn more than \$300 extra."

The question then arises as to how to compute overtime when an employee receives an annual rate of pay. The provision in the bill as we have it from the committee, and in the law as it now is, is that overtime shall be computed by dividing the annual pay by 360, on the theory that there are about 360 working days in the year, exclusive of holidays. Then if we divide 1 day's pay by 8, we have the hourly rate, and time and a half is computed on that basis.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Was any change made in the annual leave?

Mr. BURTON. No change was made in the annual leave.

Mr. TYDINGS. How much annual leave does a civil-service employee have now if he is in the classification covered by the bill?

Mr. BURTON. I think it is a month.

Mr. BYRD. Twenty-six days.

Mr. TYDINGS. How much sick leave with pay does a Federal employee receive?

Mr. BYRD. Fifteen days.

Mr. TYDINGS. That means that a Federal employee could get 41 days leave with pay, assuming that he was sick for 15 days. He would receive his regular pay.

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand, those privileges are not to be taken away. He is to have 41 days off if he is sick and on leave, and receive his pay just the same.

Mr. BURTON. Precisely so. This is an attempt to help him meet the cost of living. We must have a formula in order to reach a conclusion. Under the present law the time-and-a-half computation does not relate to his whole salary. It relates only to the first \$2,900 of his salary. On that basis, if he works 8 hours a week overtime, he could earn a maximum of \$628.

If he works more than 48 hours a week he might receive more than \$628. It is to that matter that the discussion recently related, as well as possibly to the allowance in some cases of compensatory time in lieu of money. But he could receive more than \$628. If he should work about 20 percent more time than he has been working under the 39 or 40-hour rule which has been in effect, he would be entitled to some additional compensation for the extra work. The formula which is now in effect works out so that he receives about 21.6 percent extra pay for his approximately 20-percent overtime. If we should adopt the Thomas amendment, which was in the bill as originally introduced, but not in the bill reported by the committee, instead of 21.6 percent the employee would be entitled to receive 8.30 percent, or a maximum of \$370 instead of \$628. That would entail a cost to the Government of \$219,000,000 to put the extra increase into effect, over and above what we have been paying since the 1st of December last.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Can the Senator tell me in what way the proposed legislation would affect the compensation of a civil-service employee who is receiving an annual salary of \$4,000?

Mr. BURTON. If he worked 8 hours overtime, he would receive his time and a half based on \$2,900, and also \$628 in extra pay.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest that the Senator means time and a quarter.

Mr. BURTON. The figures I have given are based on the formula we have worked out.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator from Ohio repeat what he has just stated?

Mr. BURTON. If the employee is receiving \$4,000, his added compensation relates only to the first \$2,900. Divide that amount by 360, and then divide 360 by 8. He is allowed time and a half on that basis which results in his receiving

21.6 percent of his \$2,900, or \$628. It does not make any difference whether his salary is \$3,000, or \$4,000, or \$5,000, he still receives his \$628.

Mr. TYDINGS. Would he still have a month's leave with pay?

Mr. BURTON. Yes. His month's leave of absence would not be affected at all.

Mr. TYDINGS. So he would work 11 months and 4 days, or really 11 months, because 26 days and the Sundays make a month.

Mr. BURTON. I understand that to be so.

Mr. TYDINGS. So, under the bill, he would work 11 months, he would be paid for 1 month which he did not work, and would receive about \$600 in additional pay.

Mr. BURTON. Yes, but he works 11 months now and receives 12 months' pay, and he would continue to do that.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not a member of the committee, and I am not as familiar with the bill as are the members of the committee, but my own thought concerning the bill is that the employees who are away down in the lower brackets, for instance those receiving \$1,440 and perhaps \$1,620, might have a pretty hard time to survive with the cost of living as it is in Washington. Without knowing the factors, I believe that a very strong case might be made out for those two categories. But, knowing that all the money which would be disbursed under the pending bill would come out of borrowed money, out of War bond sales, and out of money needed for the war effort, and without reflecting at all on the services of the \$4,000 or \$5,000 employees who would become beneficiaries under the pending measure, it seems to me that the position taken by the President a few days ago with reference to inflation would apply to some extent, particularly to those who are not now below what may be called the subsistence level.

I suppose the committee had good reasons for what it did, but to allow a man working for the Government to have a month off, allow him 15 days' sick leave with pay, and then give him \$600 more a year when he is already receiving \$4,000, appears to me to be somewhat inflationary.

Mr. BURTON. It was the purpose of the committee to study particularly what might be the influence of the proposed legislation on the person receiving a small amount of pay. It seemed clear that the cost of living had gone up for that person as well as others, and it was believed that there should be some adjustment made in the light of that situation, particularly in view of the fact that there had been increases in pay provided for other employees in the governmental service and in comparable services throughout the country.

In the case of the civil-service employee who does not work overtime, in contrast with the bill passed by the House a few days ago the pending amendment would allow a \$300 flat payment to each employee whether he is receiving \$1,440 or \$1,620 a year. If he should work over-

time, he would then receive a minimum of \$300.

I do not think the bill can be regarded as inflationary, and therefore subject to criticism, because it would increase the present rate of pay for all substantial purposes throughout the Government service since the 1st of last December. It will be remembered that the increase granted at that time was only an approximate adjustment to the extent that all Federal employees were below the level to which it was proposed to raise them, and the increase did not put them above that level whatever.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand, the Little Steel formula in its application to industry, we are told that the increases which the industrial workers are receiving are only those which represent the margin between what they had formerly received and the subsistence level, and that in the higher-paid brackets generally the formula does not apply. How does the bill compare with the operations we are told the War Labor Board is engaged in as applied to industrial workers?

Mr. BURTON. I would say that it is more conservative, particularly as we do not apply the rates of overtime above the first \$2,900 of pay.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not believe that many industrial workers receive \$2,900 a year.

Mr. BURTON. The industrial worker receives \$1.50 on the basis of \$1. It really amounts to what he calls only \$1.25 and is a conservative rather than an exaggerated comparison between the two.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, as I have said, I can see where a very good case could be made out for those in the lower brackets, for instance, those receiving \$1,440 and \$1,620, and others in the lower-bracket category. But if everyone is going up in the whole scale all over the country because the cost of living is going up, and there is to be no sacrifice, and the whole increase is to be paid for out of borrowed money, it appears to me as though we are abandoning the men who need the increase in order to survive. I suppose I have more Government war workers in my State than has any other Member of the Senate, because a great many of them live in Maryland. I should like to see some of those in the lower brackets receive some help. I am more than disappointed that the efforts of the committee have not been more devoted to that group, and not to those who are receiving higher salaries, which range up to a pretty high figure. It seems to me in this respect we have departed from the treatment normally applied to industrial workers.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I think the statement made by my able colleague from Maryland is a little unfair to the committee, and perhaps if I should explain the facts, the committee's action would be better understood.

We did not even begin to approach the Little Steel formula, because that formula increases basic wage rates. We do

not touch the basic wage rate. The Bacon-Davis law, the Fair Labor Standards Act, and the Walsh-Healey Act, which were passed by Congress and supported by many of us here, imposed on private enterprise an actually effective time and a half for overtime, while the pending bill would allow straight time for overtime.

In a word, we ask them to work 20 percent more time than they were working under the existing law, and we give them approximately 21 percent more money for doing so. So we have not raised basic rates, we have not given them time and a half. We have merely permitted them to work approximately 20 percent more than they have been working in the past, for which we give them about 20 percent more in money.

With respect to the 15 percent of the employees of the Federal Government engaged in arsenals, navy yards, and repair depots, men and women who have the right to take sick leave, vacation pay, and whatever else the Senator from Maryland mentioned, we give to them at regular intervals increases in their basic pay in keeping with the increases granted to private enterprise, and, in addition to that, if they earn a dollar an hour and work overtime, we give them \$1.50 an hour, whereas in the case of the employees we are now discussing, if they earn a dollar an hour and we work them overtime, we give them a dollar for working overtime. So this bill is insignificant in comparison with the "Little Steel formula." It is not to be matched with what we do for 60 percent of the Government employees, whose wages are set by wage boards and other set-ups of that type.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand, however, those in industrial employment do not get a month off every year with pay.

Mr. MEAD. But those in the Government service whose wages are fixed by wage boards, who represent 60 percent of the employees, do get a month off, under a law passed by Congress.

Mr. TYDINGS. I know that, but the Government employees are enjoying a counter benefit, which the industrial workers do not get.

Mr. MEAD. But in comparison with the Federal worker whose wages are fixed by wage boards, in comparison with the industrial worker who is the beneficiary of the provisions of the Walsh-Healey, the Bacon-Davis, and the Fair Labor Standards Acts, for which we voted, the employees for whom we are now legislating are not treated nearly so well. In my judgment, they are poorly treated in comparison with what the Congress insisted private enterprise do with its employees, or what the Congress insisted we should do with employees who work for the Government in navy yards, arsenals and repair depots, and in other similar occupations.

The committee went over this bill very thoroughly; they gave it an abundance of time and attention; they reduced the cost from the original bill supported by

the Budget and Civil Service Commission by approximately \$200,000,000. I personally believe that if it were not that I am representing the committee I should be here on the floor fighting for an amendment; but, in view of the fact that the bill has been given to me by the committee and it is my responsibility to defend it, I assert that the committee as a whole accomplished a good job, and that they should be permitted to take the bill to conference.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is there any class of employees affected by the bill who would have an increase in salary over and above that granted by the temporary legislation now in effect?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I should say those in the lower categories would. For instance, an employee receiving \$1,200 per annum, who would be given an overtime wage for working 48 hours, would probably find that his wage, with the overtime, might amount to approximately \$1,380 a year. That employee will be raised to a minimum of \$1,500. That is what we do with the employee in the lower category, and to that extent I believe we raise the wages over and above those provided in the present law.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not very familiar with the present law in that regard, but I was under the impression that the present law provided an increase of \$300.

Mr. MEAD. No; the measure we enacted does not provide a \$300 bonus. It provides only time and a half for overtime, based on a 360-day year.

Mr. RUSSELL. What evidence or what theory prompted the committee to provide for extending the proposed legislation to June 30, 1945?

Mr. MEAD. Or an earlier date, if a concurrent resolution shall be passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand that, but it would be more difficult to get Congress to terminate it than to extend it.

Mr. MEAD. That was the termination date in the bill raising the wages for postal employees, and I believe a similar provision was contained in the bill which affected policemen and firemen in the District of Columbia, though I am not sure about that. This bill provides the same termination date that was contained in the bill affecting postal employees.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not recall being present when that bill was passed, but it seems to me, that in a matter involving such considerable expense to the Government, we should not enact a law and provide that it would require action by a majority of the Congress to terminate it. Issues might alter considerably between now and 1945, and whereas it would require a majority of all the Members of the Congress to extend the provisions of the act, it would also require a majority, under the bill, to terminate it.

Mr. MEAD. The postal pay bill contained other language, but the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] at that time suggested that the same pro-

vision we have here be written into the postal pay bill, and I think he offered some very substantial reasons why it should be done. I should like to have him join in explaining the reasons to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Has the postal pay bill been finally enacted into law?

Mr. MEAD. It is at the White House.

Mr. RUSSELL. Has the President signed it?

Mr. MEAD. No.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I think there is much merit in the point made by the Senator from Georgia. The point he raises had not occurred to me. The only intent of the Senator from Virginia was to have the two acts uniform.

Mr. RUSSELL. The additional expenditure of the Government might amount to six or seven hundred million dollars, and under the provision of the pending bill it would take a majority to terminate the law.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator from Georgia will offer the amendment he has in mind, I shall support it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I propose to offer an amendment to change the termination date to June 30, 1944.

Mr. MEAD. I have no objection to the Senator offering the amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it is now past 5 o'clock, and it is apparent we cannot conclude consideration of the bill today. Is the Senator from New York willing that the Senate shall take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow?

Mr. MEAD. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask that the motion be withheld until we can dispose of one matter. I must leave Washington tonight, and the members of the committee to whom I have been able to speak are willing to have go to conference that portion of the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] dealing with compensatory time. If there is no objection, I should like to have that matter acted on.

Mr. BURTON. As I understand, we have substituted the Senate committee bill for the House bill?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON. Therefore, the provision to which the Senator from California refers, being in the Senate committee bill and not in the House bill, will go to conference, anyway.

Mr. MEAD. No; it is not in the Senate committee bill. We want it inserted in the Senate committee bill so that it will go to conference. We are considering the Senate committee bill now.

Mr. BURTON. But in order to be clear on that the Senator from California referred to a portion of the amendment of the Senator from Utah which would strike out a portion of the Senate committee bill. Is that true?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON. Therefore, if it is not stricken out, it will be in the Senate committee bill. It is not in the House text.

Mr. DOWNEY. Very well. I may say to the distinguished minority leader that I shall not delay the adjournment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator from California want us to finish with the pending amendment or let it go over?

Mr. DOWNEY. Let it go over.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to have action on the amendment on line 2, page 13. I might have some difficulty being present at the next session, and inasmuch as the Senator in charge of the bill has agreed to the amendment, would there be any objection to taking action on it at this time?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have none, but it would be necessary to lay aside temporarily the pending amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. What is the pending amendment?

Mr. BARKLEY. The amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not understand that had been offered.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator may ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment may be laid aside temporarily, in order that the amendment to the committee amendment may be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. I object if it will result in continuing the Senate in session much longer.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think there will be any objection to it.

Mr. McNARY. Very well, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] in behalf of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] to the committee amendment will be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. RUSSELL. I offer the amendment to the committee amendment on page 13, line 2, to change the date "1945" to "1944."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations under the War Manpower Commission, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. (For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there are on the executive calendar the nominations of one postmaster, and of two Army officers to be brigadier generals. I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the nominations on the executive calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and

without objection, the nominations on the executive calendar are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President may be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, April 9, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 8 (legislative day of April 6), 1943:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Edmund J. O'Boyle, from the State of New York, to be senior manpower utilization consultant in the Division of Manning Tables, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Washington office of the War Manpower Commission.

Agnes S. Cronin, from the State of New York, to be area director, at \$4,600 per annum, in the western Long Island area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Joseph G. Dellert, from the State of Pennsylvania, to be principal manpower utilization analyst, at \$5,600 per annum, in the Philadelphia regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Walter Lee McDonald, from the State of Ohio, to be area director, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Toledo area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Thomas L. Gaukel, from the State of Missouri, to be area director, at \$5,500 per annum, in the St. Louis area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Orville W. Erringer, from the State of Texas, to be area director at \$5,600 per annum, in the Dallas area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Fay William Hunter, from the State of North Dakota, to be head employment specialist, at \$6,500 per annum, in the Agricultural Division in the Washington office of the War Manpower Commission.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 8 (legislative day of April 6), 1943:

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be brigadier generals

Arthur Ringland Harris
Claude Mitchell Adams

POSTMASTER

MISSOURI

John L. Thomas, Bevier.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 8, 1943

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord, as we lift our eyes to Thee in prayer, we catch the impulse from above: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, ye have done it unto Me." We pray that we may descend into the valley of service and of sacrificial giving, not in condescension, but in loving humility; thus we shall see the right trail leading up to spiritual heights where we may find the self we should be.

O God, free us all from personal vanity, from love of applause and position. Allow not ambition, nor jealousy, nor prejudice, nor any desire of advancement keep us away from Thee, but rather bend our wills to the cross where we may learn its undying lesson. Heavenly Father, there are those with spiritual windows darkened in the midst of loneliness and desolation, and the heart has become embittered; Thou knowest that there are long stretches which weary us. As the spring sun shines out of an empty sky to warm and vitalize the barren earth that it may blossom and give forth, so may the sad, the troubled, and the tempted lift up their souls and know that our great Companion is near. He lives and shall forever live. The Lord is my Shepherd. I shall not want. In His holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter from the Governor of New Jersey and a resolution from the board of freeholders of my home county in opposition to the proposed ship canal across the State of New Jersey.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with the public service of Hon. HIRAM JOHNSON, Senator from California, and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY PLAN

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] called attention to what he described as the secret plan of Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau to establish an international stabilization fund.

The plan is so secret that three committees of the House—Foreign Affairs, Banking and Currency, and Coinage, Weights, and Measures—were all invited to meet Secretary Morgenthau and offer any suggestions that might occur to them.

The plan is so secret that it has been published Nation-wide and commented on both by radio commentators and edi-

torial writers. In spite of this fact, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] asks, "Why all the secrecy?"

The answer is very simple: What secrecy?

The fact that the meeting with the Secretary was an executive meeting, a meeting which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] attended, the only secrecy about it was that the Secretary asked that his answers to any questions be off the record, the reason being one of courtesy because the plan had not as yet been published.

The distinguished gentleman assures us that he will do all in his power to inform his people of the peril that is involved in this secret New Deal scheme.

Well, since the United States, Great Britain, and France have had a tripartite agreement of this sort for some years, and the result of the peril involved has been a \$30,000,000 profit to the Treasury of the United States, I may be pardoned if I suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that his effort to inform comes rather late.

The plan, which has a worthy and, I might add, a vital objective, the stabilization of international currencies, is merely a plan to apply to the world the mechanism used in our tripartite stabilization plan, and thus avoid the chaos that would be inevitable, in the absence of some plan, in the post-war world.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial appearing in the Pilot of April 3.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech by Mr. William Green.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Oakwood (Ohio) Press, which I believe so well evaluates present conditions as to be worthy of reading and study by every Member of Congress and by our Government officials.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include several resolutions passed by the New York State Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.